

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.
- Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue
- Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

- Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison
- Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison
- Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X



HOLMES & CO.

Published under Direction of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto.

VOL. I.

TORONTO, FEBRUARY, 1875.

No. 3.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
1. Journal of Special Session of the Synod, December, 1874.....	73
2. Visitation of the Clergy of the Diocese of Toronto, December, 1874.....	80
3. Conference of the Clergy of the " " " ".....	88
4. Missionary Work.....	90
5. Receipts.....	96

JOURNAL OF THE SPECIAL SESSION OF THE SYNOD OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

TUESDAY, December 29th, 1874.

Pursuant to notice, the Synod assembled in St. George's Church, Toronto, on Tuesday morning at 9.30 o'clock. Morning prayer was said by the Rev. Rural Dean Geddes, M.A., the Lessons being read by the Rev. T. T. Roberts, M.A., Rector of Thorold. The Ante-Communion Service was said by Rev. Rural Dean McMurray, D.D., D.C.L.; the Ven. Archdeacon Fuller, D.D., D.C.L., Rev. Rural Dean Geddes, M.A., and the Rev. T. T. Roberts, M.A., likewise assisting His Lordship, the Bishop, in the celebration of the Holy Communion.

After divine service, the Synod re-assembled in St. George's School House for the despatch of business. The customary prayers having been said by the Rev. J. G. Geddes, M.A., the Lord Bishop delivered the following

ADDRESS.

REVEREND BROTHERS AND BROTHERS OF THE LAITY:—

By the desire of the Committee to whom has been entrusted the necessary arrangements for the organization of the proposed new Diocese of Niagara, and with the advice of the Executive Committee of this Diocese, I have summoned a special meeting of our Synod.

The decision arrived at upon this subject at the last meeting of our Synod was submitted, as the law of the Church of this ecclesiastical Province demands, to the House of Bishops, at the late meeting of the Provincial Synod. The House of Bishops gave their due consideration to the proposal embraced in the memorial which was presented to them; and, without a dissentient voice, concurred in the Judgment which was in due course transmitted to the Executive Committee of this Diocese. As probably but few members of the Synod have had the opportunity of examining this document, I feel that it is due to you, as well as to the Right Reverend body from which it has emanated, to place it before you on the present occasion.

"The House of Bishops, after giving their best consideration to the Memorial from the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, in reference to the formation of a new Diocese within its limits, are constrained to express their objection to the area and extent of the said proposed Diocese as compared with that of the entire Diocese of Toronto.

"If the division proposed in the Memorial were carried out, the area of the Diocese of Toronto—as obtained from the census of 1871—would contain 6,790,533 acres; while the area of the proposed new Diocese would contain only 1,292,415 acres.

"The whole Church of England population of the Diocese of Toronto would, in such case, be 107,375; while the proposed new diocese would contain only 34,258.

"The whole number of the clergy would in that event, be 120; while the number in the new Diocese would be only 45.

"When Dioceses are divided, it is reasonable to expect that the division should be so arranged as to appropriate to each section as nearly as possible an equality of area to be traversed, and of Episcopal work to be performed. In the scheme proposed there is, in all respects, a glaring inequality.

"The House of Bishops are further to consider the influence of the proposed division upon the financial condition of the Diocese of Toronto. Were the intended arrangement to be carried out, a very small extent of what may strictly be termed Missionary territory would be comprehended in the new Diocese, and a disproportionately large one in the Diocese of Toronto. On the latter would be laid the burden of supplying a vast missionary field, with the subtraction of a very considerable annual sum by the Diocese proposed to be set off; in which annual sum are to be included large special donations, which, on carrying out the proposed division, would be lost to the Diocese of Toronto.

"The House of Bishops also feel themselves obliged, in assenting to any division of Dioceses, to keep in view the further subdivisions which, in process of time, would be called for. A Diocese of fair extent on the western side of the present Diocese of Toronto, would allow of the annexation of a considerable portion to a Diocese that might be formed at the eastern extremities of the Diocese of Huron; and by fairly reducing the present limits of the Diocese of Toronto, there would be the means of annexing at its eastern extremities such counties from the Diocese of Ontario as would form, in that direction, a Diocese of satisfactory extent. This would not be so practicable if, by adhering to the limits of the proposed western Diocese, the Diocese of Toronto should be left so large that no division on the east could be effected which would relieve the Diocese of Ontario.

"Nor can the House of Bishops allow themselves to overlook the fact that, by the terms proposed in the Memorial, a Diocese of very small extent would be permitted to send to the Provincial Synod as many delegates, both clerical and lay, as are supplied by other Dioceses of more than double the area, and more than double in Church population and the number of clergy. This strikes them as a disparity unjust in itself, and to which wide-spread objection would be made.

"The House of Bishops, gravely impressed by these considerations, would propose as an equitable arrangement the addition to the counties named in the Memorial they have received, the following, namely, the counties of Wellington, Peel, and Cardwell, with such townships in the county of Simcoe as would be comprehended within a line proceeding as directly north as possible from the eastern extremities of Peel and Cardwell, namely, the townships of Mulmur, Tossorontio, Nottawasaga, and Sunnidale. These additions would enlarge the area of the proposed Diocese to

2,798,882 acres; leaving still to the Diocese of Toronto an area of 5,284,067 acres. It would enlarge the Church population of the proposed Diocese to 58,306, leaving still to the Diocese of Toronto a Church population of 83,392. It would, too, increase the number of clergy in the proposed Diocese to 65, leaving still 100 to the Diocese of Toronto.

"In the minute of the Executive Committee of the Diocese of Toronto, accompanying the Memorial of the Synod, it is stated that the sum of \$2,000 per annum—represented by a capital sum of \$33,500—has been secured for the support of the Bishop of the proposed new Diocese. The House of Bishops feel themselves bound to protest against any deviation from the requirement heretofore demanded, namely, that a capital sum of \$40,000 should be secured for that purpose.

"Regarding the large increase in the expenses of living, since that sum was fixed upon as the minimum of endowment, they would advise rather an addition to this amount than any diminution of it; but under no circumstances could they sanction a proposal which might so injuriously affect, in all after times, the Incumbent of the Episcopal office in the proposed Diocese. Experience has manifested the difficulty of adding to endowments after Dioceses have been organized, while the amount of endowments raised is, in all cases, liable to diminution from unforeseen and unavoidable contingencies.

"The House of Bishops, in reply to the Memorial from the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, do therefore resolve:—

"That the Memorial respecting the proposed Western Diocese of Hamilton be granted, provided that the Counties of Wellington, Peel, and Cardwell, and the townships of Mulmur, Tossorontio, Nottawasaga, and Sunnidale, be added to the proposed new Diocese, and that the sum of \$40,000 of invested capital be secured, from the interest of which the Bishop shall be supported."—Carried.

(Signed) "A. MONTREAL."

September 12, 1874.

Such is the judgment of the tribunal to which this case has been submitted; and it now becomes the duty of this Synod to consider, and decide, whether it can be accepted in its entirety; or if not, what modification of its requirements it would be their pleasure to propose.

My own convictions as respects the equitable division of Episcopal work and the prospective benefits thus secured to the Church at large, are entirely in accord with the judgment of the House of Bishops. But if, after full and careful deliberation, it can be shown that the adoption of the proposed boundaries would in any other respect work inequitably and injuriously, and if such should be the decided conclusion of the Synod, I should heartily unite in the reconsideration of that judgment, with a view to the removal of the burden or the hardship which the adoption of its provisions could be shown to produce.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Before the Synod proceeded to business, a question of privilege was raised by George T. Denison, Esq., respecting the legality of the Bishop's calling a Visitation of his clergy for to-morrow. Mr. Denison moved the following resolution touching the same, seconded by Kivas Tully, Esq.:

Whereas a resolution was passed at the Visitation of the Clergy and Laity in the year 1851, declaring that for the more effectual exercise of the discipline of the Church, and the more advantageous management of its temporal affairs, it was expedient to establish a Diocesan Synod, consisting of the Laity as well as of the Clergy; and

Whereas the declaration of the Synod adopted in the year 1854 defied the powers to be exercised by the Synod, and

Whereas the Synod Act of 1856 gave power to the Bishop, Clergy, and Laity as a Synod, to make regulations for enforcing discipline in the Church, for the appointment, deposition, deprivation, or removal of any person bearing office therein, of

whatever order or degree, and for the convenient and orderly management of the property, affairs, and interests of the Church in matters appertaining to and affecting the said Church and the officers and members thereof; and

Whereas, by the Synod Amendment Act of 1858, the representation of the Laity in the Synod was clearly and finally established by law as an integral and necessary part of the Synod: and

Whereas, due provision has been made by the Synod for the due enforcement of discipline; and

Whereas a visitation of the Clergy of this Diocese has been ordered by His Lordship the Bishop for tomorrow, the 30th inst, to consider and take action upon matters relating to Church order and discipline, and to the Mission Fund and Students' Fund, and to investigate and decide upon charges made against the legitimate organization of the Church, and otherwise to assume to exercise functions legally vested in the Synod:

It is therefore resolved,

That this Synod declares that due provision has already been made for enforcing discipline: that all questions relating to the temporal affairs of this Diocese, including the Mission Fund and Students' Fund, being legally under the control and direction of the Synod, that it and it alone has the power of investigating and interfering in the management of these funds, or charges against the management, and that any attempt on the part of two branches of this Synod to usurp the power and authority of the Synod as a whole, is a breach of the privileges of the Synod, and an infringement of the rights of the Laity as by law established."

The Bishop ruled that the proposed resolution was out of order.

THE PROPOSED NIAGARA DIOCESE.

Ven. Archdeacon Fuller read the following report of the Standing Committee on the proposed Western Diocese;—

The Sub-committee of the proposed Diocese of Niagara, usually called "the Provisional Committee," beg leave to report:—

That when the decision of the House of Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada, adding the counties of Wellington, Peel, and Cardwell, and the townships of Mulmur, Nottawasaga, Sunnidale, and Tossoronto, to the five original counties, and increasing the required endowment, before the Bishop can be elected, to \$40,000, and that of invested capital, was received, the Chairman of the Committee addressed to the Lord Bishop of the Diocese a letter, calling His Lordship's attention to the requirement of the 9th canon of the Provincial Synod, which is to the following effect: "It shall be the duty of such Synods," (as are affected by the action of the House of Bishops) "to consider, without delay, any proposal for the sub-division of a Diocese which may emanate from the House of Bishops." His Lordship, however, did not like to call a meeting of the Synod on his own responsibility, but asked the advice of the Executive Committee of the Diocese in regard thereto.

That the Executive Committee met on the 3rd September, and passed a resolution to the following effect:—That this Executive Committee, assuming that the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto will adopt the resolution of the House of Bishops in reference to the altered boundaries of the new Diocese, and to the sum fixed for its endowment, will be prepared to advise the Bishop of Toronto to call a special meeting of the Synod as soon as the \$40,000 has been raised or guaranteed.

As two of the members of the Sub-committee were obliged to leave on the 5th of October to attend the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, about to assemble at New York, as members of a deputation from the Provincial Synod of Canada, it was thought advisable to call together as many members of the Sub-committee as could be summoned for the 2nd of October, that no more time should be lost.

That those present considered it advisable to try and carry out the decision of the House of Bishops, and the advice given by the Executive Committee to His Lordship the Bishop of the Diocese; and accordingly instructed their Secretary and

general agent to address a circular to all the Incumbents of parishes embraced in the additional territory, asking them when it would be convenient for them to receive him, or some one else, to raise the balance of the required endowment.

That another meeting of said Sub-committee was held at Hamilton on the 30th of October, at which the replies received from many of the Incumbents, to whom the circular had been addressed by the Secretary or general agent, were read. These were found so generally adverse to the boundaries proposed by the House of Bishops, especially those from the counties of Peel and Cardwell, and the four townships in the County of Simcoe, that it was evident to said Sub-committee that the scheme could not be carried out. Some of them said that they were quite willing to contribute something to the endowment of the proposed new Sec, but it must be on the condition that they were allowed to remain in the old one, as all their business and other connections were with the City of Toronto, and that in order to reach Hamilton (the probable seat of the proposed new Sec) they would all have to go to Toronto, and then to Hamilton.

That a good deal of stress was laid upon the uncertainty connected with their position until the Diocese of Toronto had, in Synod assembled, decided whether the proposition of the House of Bishops would be accepted, or rejected, or modified by it.

That these arguments are so incontrovertible, and the feeling of those residing in those counties and townships so decided, that it appeared to the members of the Sub-committee that there was no possibility of raising any more of the endowment until the Synod had decided the question of the boundaries of the proposed new Diocese. In accordance with these views, they unanimously adopted the following resolution, on motion of the Rev. H. Holland, seconded by Wm. Powis, Esq., "That this meeting begs respectfully to represent to the Lord Bishop of the Diocese that the recent decision of the House of Bishops with respect to the enlarged boundaries of the proposed Niagara Diocese, renders it impossible for the Committee to proceed further with the endowment until a session of the Synod of the Diocese shall have been held to consider the said decision; and that his Lordship be, therefore, requested to call a special meeting of the Synod at the earliest possible time; and that the following gentlemen be appointed a deputation to wait upon His Lordship, the Bishop, for the purpose of presenting this resolution viz: the Ven. Archdeacon Fuller; the Rev. J. G. Geddes, the Rev. Dr. McMurray, and the Rev. Dr. Read; Messrs. Plumb, Powis, and Pettit.

That said deputation met His Lordship the Bishop on the 4th of November, and were cordially received by him—that they shewed His Lordship that by the arrangement proposed by the House of Bishops the support of 34 missionaries out of 61 was thrown on the proposed new Diocese, whilst there would be left to the large Diocese of Toronto, after the division, 27 missions to support—that they further shewed to His Lordship that it would be a great hardship to compel the Clergy and Lay delegates in order to reach their Synod or to hold any personal intercourse with their Bishop, to pass through Toronto and go thence to Hamilton, since there was no railway (as had been supposed) from Hamilton to Collingwood.

That these arguments weighed with His Lordship, who stated that the House of Bishops desired to do no injustice to the proposed new Diocese, which appeared would be the case, from the statements then made, if their proposal should be persisted in.

That it was then suggested that a compromise might be effected by adding to the five original counties the County of Wellington. This was assented to by all parties present, so far as they had the power to do so. His Lordship the Bishop promised the deputation to consult with his Brother Bishops as to their willingness to accept this compromise, and to recommend their doing so; and that as soon as he should receive a favourable reply from them, he would call a meeting of the Synod to consider the important question that has now brought the members of the Synod together at this unusual season of the year.

That your Committee would call the attention of the Synod to the requirement embodied in the proposal of the House of Bishops sent to this Diocese, viz.: that the proposed endowment of \$40,000 should be invested capital.

This your Committee would respectfully suggest, is laying too heavy a burden

on the new Diocese, and placing a difficulty in the way of its organization, which, will be very hard if not impossible, to overcome.

Their Lordships the House of Bishops stated that they were unwilling that the rule laid down on former occasions, viz., that the endowment should not be less than £40,000 should be departed from. Your Committee would respectfully submit that the minutes of this Diocese shew in no part any requirement that the endowments for either the Dioceses of Huron, Ontario, or Toronto, should be invested in public securities; but invariably speak of them as "subscriptions" towards the endowment of those respective Sees. To require the investment of the endowment of the proposed new See in public securities would be to imperil the whole scheme; for your Committee do not consider it possible to find capitalists who would be prepared to take the notes of hand already secured or to be secured, and pay the money for them or give debentures for them, without exacting a ruinous discount. But your Committee are prepared to support any proposition requiring every person who desires time to pay what he desires contributing to the endowment of the proposed See, to secure his contribution by giving a note of hand or other obligation in writing, to pay his contribution, which could be collected in one of our Courts. In matters of this kind your Committee conceive that some faith should be placed in individual Churchmen to keep their engagements. Such a stringent regulation as that laid down by the House of Bishops with regard to the endowment of the proposed See was never required, that your Committee ever heard of, in regard to the building of a church, a school house, or a college. If it had been, there would have been far fewer churches, school-houses, and colleges in our land than now adorn it to afford the means of grace and education to our people; nor is any such requirement found in the United States, where our sister Church is making rapid progress, through the subdivision of dioceses, and affording us great encouragement in our important work of extending the Kingdom of Christ to regions where it is yet unknown.

T. B. FULLER, *Chairman.*

Hamilton, 17th December, 1874.

Ven. Archdeacon FULLER, in moving the adoption of the report of the Committee, pointed out that the American Church had divided no less than eight dioceses within the last three months, and that some of them had not more than 25 resident clergy.

Mr. POWIS, in seconding the motion, said, that after the action of the House of Bishops, he was willing to agree to the addition of the County of Wellington.

Hon. H. B. BULL suggested an amendment to the following effect:—

That as the several notes are paid in, and the donations handed to the Treasurer, the amounts be invested in Government securities or county debentures.

Ven. Archdeacon FULLER agreed to the amendment.

In answer to Dr. J. G. HODGINS, Honorary Lay Secretary,

His LORDSHIP said the House of Bishops had promised to accept any arrangement which he might approve of.

Ven. Archdeacon FULLER read a letter from the Bishop of Huron, stating that anything to which the Bishop of Toronto consented would have his fullest concurrence.

Rev. Rural Dean LEFT said the Bishop of Ontario had stated the same thing.

After a discussion, in which Hon. Vice-Chancellor Blake, Hon. Mr. Patton, Revs. Dr. McMurray, Canon Read, Rural Dean Geddes, Mr. Holland and J. B. Worrell, and Messrs. J. P. Plumb, M.P., A. H. Campbell, G. T. Denison, and J. C. Chadwick took part, the motion for the adoption of the report was put and declared carried.

Archdeacon FULLER moved, seconded by Rev. Dr. LETT,

That whereas this Synod did at its last session request the House of Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada to set apart the counties of Lincoln, Welland, Haldimand, Wentworth and Halton, parts of this Diocese, to constitute a new Diocese; and whereas the House of Bishops replied that they would give their consent to such request on condition that the counties of Wellington, Peel, and Cardwell, and the four townships of Mulmur, Nottawasaga, Sunnidale, and Tossorontio, should be added to the five above named counties, to constitute said new Diocese, and that the endowment for the support of the Bishop thereof should be increased to \$40,000 of invested capital; and whereas the Committee appointed to raise said endowment have reported that they deem it utterly impossible to obtain anything from the counties of Peel, Cardwell, and the four above-named townships, in consequence of their geographical position, which would render any severance from the Diocese of Toronto and connection with the proposed new Diocese exceedingly inconvenient; and whereas the same objection does not lie against the addition of the County of Wellington;

Be it therefore resolved, that this Synod do now adopt the following request to the House of Bishops, to grant a division of this Diocese, to constitute a new Diocese, to be composed of the six counties of Lincoln, Welland, Haldimand, Wentworth, Halton, and Wellington, as soon as the Executive Committee of this Diocese shall have reported to the Lord Bishop thereof that the sum of \$40,000 over and above all expenses of collection shall have been secured in cash or notes of hand or other written engagements to pay collectable in one of our courts of law:—

To the Most Reverend the Metropolitan and their Lordships the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada, assembled as the House of Bishops.

“The petition of the Bishop, the Clergy, and Lay Representatives of the Diocese of Toronto in Synod assembled, humbly sheweth,

“That whereas, by clause IX of the Canon adopted at the fifth session of the Provincial Synod, your Right Reverend House has been clothed with the power of sub-dividing existing Dioceses, or of forming a new Diocese out of portions of existing Dioceses which may be contiguous, with the concurrence or upon the application of the Synod or Synods of the Diocese or Dioceses affected; and whereas the Diocese of Toronto in Diocesan Synod assembled has passed resolutions declaring it desirable that the counties of Lincoln, Welland, Haldimand, Wentworth, Halton, and Wellington, now parts of this Diocese, should be separated to form a new Diocese: the said Synod of the Diocese of Toronto now beg respectfully that your Right Reverend House will separate and set apart said counties as a distinct Diocese, thus giving effect to this our memorial.”

Hon. Vice-Chancellor BLAKE moved in amendment, seconded by Rev. H. HOLLAND, B.A.,

That in place of the words “forty thousand dollars in cash or notes,” the words “forty thousand dollars in cash or other good securities” be inserted.

The amendment was declared lost.

The original motion was then put and carried.

Rev. J. H. McCOLLUM, M.A., moved, seconded by the Rev. J. CARRY, B.D.,

That in the opinion of this Synod the name of the new western Diocese be the Diocese of Hamilton, or if the Synod have not the power to give the name, that it respectfully suggest to those having the power that the new Western Diocese be called the Diocese of Hamilton.

Rev. Canon READ, having objected to the discussion on this question proceeding any further, as this was not the place to settle the question. Rev. Mr. McCOLLUM withdrew his motion.

Rev. J. B. WORRELL, M.A., seconded by Rev. Canon OSLER, M.A., moved,

That a Committee be appointed to examine the securities for the Episcopal Endowment Fund for the proposed Western Diocese, and report to the Executive Committee; and that the Lord Bishop be respectfully requested not to convene a Synod for the election of a Bishop of said proposed diocese until said Executive Committee report that the endowment (viz. \$40,000) required by the Right Rev. House of Bishops is amply secured.

Rev. Rural Dean GEDDES, M.A., having pointed out that provision had been made for this examination, the motion was withdrawn.

Rev. Rural Dean GEDDES, M.A., asked the Bishop if he would recommend the Bench of Bishops to take action in accordance with the result that had been arrived at here to-day.

His LORDSHIP said that he would recommend that the boundaries of the new Diocese be as this Synod had proposed. He did not attach much importance to the question of the finances, but he did not think any Synod could go too far in placing matters on such a footing that there could be no doubt as to the regularity of the supply. However, he would not make that opinion an obstacle in the way of the formation of the new Diocese, but would leave the Bishops to deal with the matter.

Rev. Rural Dean GEDDES, M.A., moved, seconded by Rev. Canon READ, D.D.,

That the Clergy and Lay-delegates of the six counties of Lincoln, Welland, Haldimand, Wentworth, Halton, and Wellington, be appointed a Standing Committee for the purpose of completing the endowment for the proposed Western Diocese and taking such other steps as may be necessary to give effect to the present action of this Synod, and that during the absence of the Venerable Archdeacon Palmer, the senior Archdeacon, the Venerable the Archdeacon of Niagara, be the convener of the Committee. Carried.

The business of the Synod having been concluded, his Lordship congratulated the members on the conclusion of their business and on the result which they had arrived at. He then pronounced the benediction, and the proceedings terminated.

A. J. BROUGHALL, M.A.,

Honorary Clerical Secretary.

J. GEORGE HODGINS, LL.D.,

Honorary Lay Secretary.

VISITATION

OF THE

CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

Wednesday, 30th December, 1874.

Pursuant to notice, the Lord Bishop of Toronto held a Visitation of his Clergy in St. George's Church this day. After Divine service the Bishop ascended the pulpit, and delivered the following charge:—

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,

Although, in the announcement of my purpose to hold this Visitation of the Clergy of the Diocese, I laid before you the reasons which induced me to call you together, I shall be obliged to repeat them to some extent on this occasion.

The great body of the Clergy of this Diocese have been charged with false and unscriptural teaching by a considerable number of Clergymen and Laymen, designating themselves the "Church Association of the Diocese of Toronto." And the long organized Institutions of the Diocese for the training of candidates for the ministry, and for the prosecution of its missionary work, have been spoken of by that Association in terms of such disparagement and condemnation that, in their judgment, there should be an utter demolition of those Institutions, and the substitution in their room of new organizations under the auspices of that Association. The following statements in a recent address from that body cannot be construed to have a more limited intention than this:—

"Many members of the Church of England have felt compelled, much against their inclination, to withhold their contributions from the funds of the Church. They feel that it is impossible for them to assist in maintaining a Students' Fund for the support of young men who are carefully trained to look with aversion on our Church as a Church of the Reformation, and to abhor the name Protestant; or to build up a Mission Fund for the support of men who become worthy disciples of such teachings, and the propagators of these and more extreme views."

To these statements a wide circulation has been given in and beyond the Diocese; and it is well that the Clergy, whom these imputations mainly affect, should have the opportunity of considering carefully together the character and purport of these allegations, and proclaim to the world that judgment upon their utter groundlessness at which they cannot fail to arrive.

It is more than insinuated that, in our University of Trinity College, such objectionable and erroneous teaching has been pursued, and that, therefore it is an unsafe institution for the religious training of young men, and especially of aspirants to the ministry of the Church. I am persuaded that the strictest investigation, if such should be needed, would fail to establish the truth of such an allegation. The students of that University, I feel the fullest assurance, have never been taught to look with aversion on the Reformation of the Church, or to abhor the name of Protestant. But I can understand that they have been taught—as it was right they should—what the true position is in which our Church was placed at the Reformation; when and how the name of Protestant took its rise; and in what sense it is fittingly employed now. And in doing so there would be no room for disparagement; but, on the contrary, much cause for thankfulness that the circumstances of God's Church were so ordered as to give occasion for the use of those terms.

It is however, of essential importance that there should be a right conception of the term "Reformation," as applied to any branch of God's Church. The term clearly pre-supposes a Church in existence; and a reformation should be so conducted as to allow it to be a continuous Church—not uprooted and destroyed, and another placed in its room. This would be doing violence to God's work; it would be infringing principles which God himself has settled. A reformation means not the thorough and complete breaking down of a whole fabric, but the purification and correction of abuses and innovations that have been introduced.

The Church in our mother-country was from the beginning a Scriptural and Apostolic Church, although, through man's inventions and depravity, it became corrupted and defiled, but errors and superstitions could not destroy its form and model, nor touch the rock of its foundation. Our Reformers, then, did what duty and wisdom impelled them to do. They cleansed away that rubbish of superstition; they removed those incrustations of error and defilement. They restored the pure doctrine of the Apostles, while they maintained their order and fellowship; and they restored to a gladdened people the purity and completeness of the Church of the living God.

The change from the soundness of her principles had been violently and unauthorizedly made; and wise and good and able men, with the Divine help, repudiated that change, and brought the Church back to its original condition—to what it was at its first planting in the land by Apostolic hands.

Surely no wise and well-instructed Christian person could speak disparagingly of a Reformation like this, or regard it otherwise than as a cause for thankfulness. It is true that, in the many minds and many hues of thought amongst professing members of the Church, there will be some who have their own eccentric views and

speculations as to the reality and completeness of this work. Some have affirmed that this great Reformation did not go far enough. They desired that it should be more sweeping and searching; in the exuberance of a revolutionary spirit, they were content even that it should overturn Divine arrangements, and uproot principles which are incontrovertibly Apostolic and Divine. And there are others who think the Reformation of the Church of England has gone too far. They contend that while the essential varieties of doctrine and order should be retained there should be a retention also of many of the abuses in ritual that had been introduced during the intellectual and spiritual darkness of the middle ages. Some of these misguided men—not duly appreciating the blessings they possess, and discarding that loyalty to the Church which is honestly due to her—have, we grieve to say, spoken of the Reformation in terms of disrespect and even vituperation, which have sorely tried and distressed the sound and faithful members of our national Church.

The term "Protestant," too, through a similar perverted style of reasoning, has come under the reproach of some, and experienced an unseemly abuse. The origin of the term, it must be remembered, was not connected with the first grand movement in the direction of the Reformation of the Church. Many years after this great work was started a Diet was held at Speirs in 1529 by order of the Emperor Charles V., which decided on enjoining all the States of the Empire to persevere in observing the decree against Luther, and in prohibiting any further innovation in the prevailing religion. Against this decree there was a strong and solemn protest by a large number of deputies, headed by the Elector of Saxony.

This protest is deservedly applauded; but it was not the beginning, nor did it pertain to the essence of the Reformation. It was an adjunct rather, not a recognized term by which to designate the Reformation itself. This great work went beyond a mere protest; it was the vigorous and successful action of a great body of the faithful throughout Europe. The Church of England, sympathizing as she heartily did with the protest against the edict of Spire, did not adopt that protest as a watchword, or as a ground of action. She took a wider scope, and worked upon a broader foundation. And much as the term "Protestant" has ever since been revered in the Church of England, it has never been recognized as one that fully expresses her position as the Church of that country reformed from Papal abuses. The name Protestant never occurs in our authorized formularies; it is never used in the description of our Church; it is never introduced in connection with the National Church in our Acts of Parliament. Its true designation was always felt to be the Church of England; a veritable, genuine branch of the Catholic Church throughout the world.

Many, we can understand, would be very jealous of the limitation which the connection of the term Protestant with the recognized and rightful title of the Church of England would imply. The adoption of it would seem to post-date the origin of the Church; it would seem to make it commence from the period at which such protest was uttered. It would be giving countenance to the justice of the Romanist enquiry, "Where was your Church before Luther?"

Too many, in pursuing a sound argument, allow themselves to be carried beyond legitimate bounds both in reasoning and expression. There is no reason for vilifying or renouncing the word Protestant, because it has been used in an unjustifiable sense and application. We should ever remember with gratitude and honour the occasion which gave rise to it; for there are now, and there are long likely to be, occasions in which the same protest should be expressed against the tenets and assumptions which roused the spirit of the German Reformers. When, through subtlety or force, such tenets should be thrust upon us, we should all be as ready as they were—all as earnest and decided—in the declaration of our solemn protest. While we claim to be a genuine branch of the Catholic Church of Christ, we are firmly Protestant against every false tenet and every unscriptural pretension asserted by the Romish Church, or any other religious body.

We shall all admit that the Church in every age has suffered much from the coldness, and laxity, and indifference of her professed members on the one hand, and from their too ardent temperament and vehement zeal on the other hand. We have witnessed in the past and present generation an evidence of both. Undue zeal was provoked by a death-like supineness; heat and extravagance bore its proportion to

the lethargy that evoked it. But from the wise and widening fusion of these opposing elements, we have had results for which the Church must be thankful.

"I wish," said the late Prime Minister of England, Mr. Gladstone, in recently addressing the House of Commons, and his words fell with the force of truth upon his audience,— "I wish that every man in this House were as old as I am for the purpose of knowing what was the condition of the Church of England forty or fifty years ago. At that time it was a scandal to Christendom. Its congregations were cold, dead, and irreverent. Its music was offensive to any one with a respect for the house of God. Its clergy, with some numerous exceptions—belonging chiefly, though not exclusively, to what was then called the Evangelical School—its clergy were in numbers I should not like to mention, worldly-minded men, not conforming by their practice to the standard of their high office, but seeking to accumulate preferments with a reckless indifference to the souls of the people, and on the whole declining in moral influence. This is the state of things from which we have escaped. And when I hear complaints as to the state of things in the present day, I cannot forget the enormous balance of good over the evils you suffer, which has been achieved by the astonishing transformation that has come over the character of the clergymen of the Church of England. That change makes it now almost a moral certainty that whenever you go into a parish, you will find the clergyman a man who, to the best of his ability, and with little sparing of his health, is spending morning, noon, and night upon the work of his calling; teaching the young, visiting the sick, preaching the Word, and conforming, as far as he can, to the model his Master left him to follow."

Yes, there has been an "enormous balance of good over the evils" that have followed. But these evils we still must deplore, and we hope to see them removed. We must lament the extravagancies and wrong action of the few, while we honour and applaud the sober energy and honest toil of the many. We must lament the introduction of novelties in worship, and novelties in doctrine, which the few unite with their earnest work and self-sacrificing course; the imported adjuncts which soil a pure worship; the symbols foisted in of doctrine which the Church to which they owe allegiance recognizes not, but rejects.

That unfaithful and unwise course by sons of the Church who might so much strengthen and bless her, may rarely be visible amongst ourselves; very few, if any, of the clergy in this Diocese sympathise with that rampant irregularity and too obvious disloyalty. Yet it would be vain to deny that we have its leaven amongst us, and that there are signs of its unrighteous working. We ask these affectionately to pause and beware; for everything extreme and unwarranted in their teaching and their worship is wounding and injuring the Church which they profess to love. Let them throw in their lot, bravely and honestly with the loyal and the wise, and yield to the control and direction of those who are over them in the Lord.

And, with equal affection, let me address those who, in an opposite direction, are withholding obedience from the manifest requirements of the Church. Upon one important point her words are these:—"It is evident unto all men diligently reading the Holy Scripture and ancient authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." And, "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination."

These words very clearly show what, in the judgment of the Church, constitutes a lawful ministry. And if episcopal ordination is, in her judgment, necessary, an episcopal succession, as a logical sequence, is equally necessary. Nor is there any difficulty in exhibiting to the world the fact of this succession—to take two important instances—in the See of Canterbury, in England, and of Armagh, in Ireland. Painful then it is to consistent and loyal Churchmen to see any of their brethren—a few though they may be in number—impugning a leading and essential principle of the Church; declaring their opposition to it in words and by example. Non-natural interpretations of the Church's clear and explicit declarations, adduced to excuse their non-compliance with them, will no more satisfy the minds of faithful

and conscientious Churchmen than the asseverations of those who profess loyalty to the Church, while they teach and practice the superstitions which the Church at the Reformation cleared away.

I think I have all along in this address been asserting facts, and expressing sentiments in which I shall have the great mass of the Clergy of this Diocese to concur. And we cannot adhere to them the less if they should fail to gain the assent of those who have ventured upon so sweeping a denunciation of the teaching of the clergy of this Diocese, and who have made the assumed corruption of well nigh the whole body a ground for the organization of institutions which are to supersede all that is already being done for the training of ministers and the spread of the Gospel in this Diocese.

In addition to this allegation, we have this further ground for such action declared,—“There has also been a wide-spread, and certainly not causeless feeling that the management of the moneys of the Church has been such as to entail much loss and injury to the funds entrusted to the control of certain of her members.” We must express our amazement at the gratuitous, causeless introduction of language like this; at this resurrection of a long buried grievance—a grievance, the dealing with which the Synod has taken into its own hands—a grievance which never had connection, actually or presumably, with that fund which aids in the support of the missionaries of the Diocese. But while we wonder, we must grieve that the prejudices of party or of individuals should be allowed to override the bonds of Christian charity and truth, and seem willing to make a wreck of high interests and a good work as the price of the indulgence of such prejudices.

In consistent keeping with this is the purport of a tract issued by the “Church Association” not many days later. It devotes several pages to citations from a publication entitled “Vox Dei, aut vox populi,” a work published in Ottawa, much beyond the precincts of this Diocese, and anonymously; no clergyman that I am aware of, in this Diocese at least, endorsing its opinions or countenancing its statements, and yet it is implied that it is viewed with favour by the great body of the Clergy in this Diocese; it is insinuated as being the teaching on their part which, “while building up the Church of Rome, and filling the Churches of other denominations, disgusts and alienates the vast majority of the members of our Church.”

They must be a very small fraction indeed of the Clergy of this Diocese, if there be any who have the slightest sympathy with the ravings and the reckless slanders of such publications. But we cannot help, however much we must deplore, ebullitions like these. If they flood the land, we have no power beyond our earnest protest to stop the pernicious inundation. To hundreds, perhaps thousands, of our Church members, the citation of these extracts by the Church Association will be their first advertisement; and they may excite a curiosity that will result in evil to many a soul. Publications indicating a positive infidelity are now and then infused; and these will hardly awaken in the minds of sound and earnest Churchmen more grief and repulsion than the tirade of bitter phrases and untruthful statements which disfigure the pages of that work. It is but blasphemy to term it the work of God; and it will never be the utterance of God’s true people.

I do not desire, brethren, to dwell longer on a painful and unwelcome theme. Assailed as the Clergy of this Diocese have been, I feel that I could not say less. I do not without a belief that such of the Clergy at least as have allowed their names to be linked in this sweeping impeachment of the truth and soundness of their brethren, will see and admit the injustice, and withdraw the unfounded accusation. With the meagre few who can be believed to merit the imputation thus recklessly thrown upon the whole, there is a legitimate course of dealing, and the opportunity will now be afforded.

I have hopes, independently, that the interchange of opinion, in a kind and brotherly spirit, may draw better together those who have been sundered, and that a way may be prepared for the exercise of mutual love and united action in the cause of God’s Church. We have much to be thankful for, whatever may be asserted to the contrary, in the steady progress of the Church in this Diocese, and its growth especially in this city. Let there be a mutual toleration of what, to a certain extent, must always prevail—difference of opinions and difference of tastes. Even great and essential truths may not be accepted on all hands with an exactness of

sentiment: and God's worship can be faithfully and consistently performed with the possibility of diversities which inar no principle, and violate no authority. Let our ritual be said or sung—as the Church permits—without the taunt that the one betokens coldness, or that the other indicates a tendency to superstitious observances and an unsound creed. With baseless suspicious throws aside, let there be a joint effort with the sound and sober-minded to restrain excesses where they present themselves, and supply short-comings and deficiencies where they are observable.

The mission of the Church is to promote social peace and order, individual holiness, and the eternal happiness of all. Its commission is to bring men to Christ, the great Atener, and to induce them, by teaching and example, to follow the blessed steps of His most holy life. At peace with God through this most precious sacrifice, it was designed that they should be at peace with one another. This purpose, you must feel, is grievously violated, if there be the in-ustrious diffusion of calumnious accusation and uncharitable insinuation against any of the brethren. When bitterness prevails and strife is active, there will be a speedy lowering, and at last the extinctions of the pure spiritual life. The indulgence of the temper of the world will give the world its victory; and with such victory there will be the estrangement of souls from God.

I trust that all will strive to avoid this fearful responsibility—the throwing upon the consciences of themselves and others so intolerable a burden. Let the true mission of God's ministers be the subject always of humble prayer and hearty effort. Let the passions and enmities which are of this world be put away, and good-will and brotherly affection and a kindly charity be made to take their place. Loving one another and working with one another we shall be contributing each our mite towards making "the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ."

At two o'clock the Clergy assembled in St. George's School house, the Bishop in the chair.

The Hon. J. HILLYARD CAMERON, D.C.L., M.P., Chancellor of the Diocese, stated the object of the Visitation as declared in his Lordship's note and charge, and announced that this being a Visitation of the Clergy alone, only clergymen and churchwardens who had presentments to offer containing charges against their clergymen would be permitted to be present. It was his Lordship's wish that all others should withdraw.

Rev. Rural Dean COOPER remarked that in England Visitations were always held in the Churches, which were open to anyone who chose to enter. He believed that no notice or intimation had been given that churchwardens who desired to present their clergymen were expected to be present.

The BISHOP said nothing definite would be done here. Presentments might be made here, but any action on them would have to be taken elsewhere.

The CHANCELLOR said it was not necessary to hold any Visitation in this country in exactly the same way in which they did in England. It was for the Bishop to say whether he was willing to allow others than clergymen to be present or not.

The BISHOP said that he had called the Clergy together alone, and he expected that no strangers would be present.

The CHANCELLOR then, by his Lordship's directions, called upon all present who were not clergymen to withdraw.

The Laymen present accordingly left the hall.

The following were read as the questions on which presentations were required to be made :—

1. Is Divine Service duly and reverentially performed in your several churches, without alteration, addition, or diminution, according to law, the Canons of the Church, and the rubric of the *Book of Common Prayer*? And if not, who is in fault?

2. Have any Priests or Ministers of the Word of God among you met together to consult on any matter or course to be taken by them, or upon their motion or direction, or by direction of any other, which may in any way tend to the impeaching or depraving of the doctrine of the Church of England or of the *Book of Common Prayer* or any part of the government or discipline of the Church of England in this Diocese?

3. Is any Priest or Minister of the Word of God among you a hinderer of the Word of God being read or sincerely preached, or a defender of Popish and erroneous doctrines?

The Rev. Rural Dean COOPER again raised the question in regard to the Court, to which he had previously called attention. He said that the canon required the churchwardens and questmen to present the clergymen against whom charges were made. He stated that a presentment of a clergyman had been served on the Bishop by two churchwardens within a few hours back.

The CHANCELLOR said he held that presentment in his hand. He admitted that the case as set forth thereon was one which called for a commission, but said that as he had no proof that the signatures to it were genuine, and as no one was present to vouch for their genuineness, he could not advise the Bishop to proceed to deal with it.

After some further debate, it was settled that the presentment could not be received now, but that a presentment with regard to the matter might be made at any time and would be received as though it had been made at the Visitation, and dealt with by a commission appointed by the Bishop.

The presentment referred to was from the churchwardens of St. Philip's Church, Weston, charging their clergyman, among other things with having on Christmas Day, when administering the Holy Communion, placed himself in the position of a sacrificing priest, turned his back to the people, elevated the elements, turned his back to the people, made the sign of the cross twice above the head of each communicant, &c. On the 27th inst., he also preached against Protestantism. The churchwardens intimated their intention, if nothing was done to put a stop to these practices, to close the doors of the church on Sunday, the 10th of January.

The above subject having been disposed of, the Chancellor asked for presentments, and the Rev. Rural Dean GEDDES, M.A., after a few remarks as to the painful character of the duty he had to perform, presented in the name of the several Rural Deans, the following gentlemen, and charged them as members of the Church Association with "depraving the government and discipline of the Church," viz. :—

1. The Very Rev. Dean GRASETT, B.D., Rector of St. James's Cathedral, Toronto.
2. The Rev. Canon BALDWIN, M.A., Assistant Minister of St. James's Cathedral, Toronto.
3. The Rev. Rural Dean GIVINS, Rector of St. Paul's, Toronto.
4. The Rev. Rural Dean STEWART, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean of Orillia.
5. The Rev. Rural Dean COOPER, M.A., Rector of Etobicoke.
6. The Rev. F. A. O'MEARA, LL.D., Rector of St. John's, Port Hope.
7. The Rev. ALEXANDER SANSON, Rector of Trinity Church, Toronto.
8. The Rev. S. J. BODDY, M.A., Rector of St. Peter's Church, Toronto.
9. The Rev. W. F. CHECKLEY, M.A., Assistant Minister of St. Paul's Church, Toronto.
10. The Rev. H. H. WATERS, M.A., Assistant Minister of St. James's Cathedral, Toronto.
11. The Rev. G. H. MOXON, Minister of St. Paul's Mission Church, Toronto.

The Presentment was to the following effect:--

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF TORONTO:

We, JOHN GAMBLE GEDDES, STEPHEN LETT, W. McMURRAY, F. L. OSLER, C. E. THOMSON, J. WILSON, and W. T. SMITHETT, all of the Diocese of Toronto, Clerks in Holy Orders and Rural Deans, do present unto your Lordship:

That the Very Reverend H. J. GRASETT, Dean of Toronto, the Reverends Rural Dean STEWART, Rural Dean GIVINS, Dr. O'MEARA, S. J. BODDY, A. SANSON, Canon BALDWIN, Rural Dean H. C. COOPER, W. F. CHECKLEY, H. H. WATERS, and G. H. MOXON, being Priests and Ministers of the Word of God within the Diocese of Toronto and members of the Synod thereof, did meet together within six months before the making of this Presentment and did consult and agree upon a course to be taken by them and others, which tends to the impeaching and depraving of part of the Government and Discipline of the Church of England in this Diocese.

That the said Priests and Ministers are all members of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto, and have declared their obedience to the canons and declarations thereof, either by actual written promise or by virtual promise of obedience thereto.

That as part of the organization of the Synod and of the Government of the Church of England in the Diocese of Toronto, a Board of Missions has been established by canon of the Synod for the establishment and maintenance of missions and the distribution of moneys collected under the authority of the Synod for that purpose.

That the said Priests and Ministers before mentioned have, in contravention of the said canon, impeached and depraved a part of the Government of the Church of England in this Diocese, by making a new and different organization through an association called "The Church Association of the Diocese of Toronto," for the same objects as are provided for by the said canon.

That as a ground for the said organization, the said Priests and Ministers have published and circulated throughout the Diocese a report signed by the said The Very Reverend H. J. GRASETT, Dean of Toronto, which further depraves and impeaches the Government of the said Church as to the said Board of Missions by falsely and unjustly stating, "That the present mission funds of this Diocese go to support teaching at variance with that of the Church, and which, while building up the Church of Rome, and filling the churches of other denominations, disgusts and alienates the vast majority of the members of our Church."

The Rev. SEPTIMUS JONES, M.A., enquired upon what principle the selection of those members of the Church Association had been made. He said that he was a member of that Association, and as guilty as the others with regard to the part of the paper that had been referred to—the appeal in behalf of a new Mission and Students' fund.

Rev. W. F. CHECKLEY, M.A., said that though he belonged to the Church Association and approved of its objects generally, he had not been a participant in the action recommended by it in the address alluded to.

The other gentlemen charged in the presentment, while avowing their participation in the action in question, solemnly denied that they had in any way by such action deprived the government or discipline of the Church.

After a consultation between the Bishop and the Chancellor, it was intimated by the Chancellor that His Lordship considered the case one of sufficient gravity to induce him to issue a commission appointing an investigation of the charges.

This concluded the business of the Visitation, and the meeting accordingly dissolved.

CONFERENCE OF THE CLERGY.

Immediately after the Visitation, a conference of all the Clergy who remained was held, with the Bishop in the chair. After a few complimentary remarks, his Lordship was presented by the Rev. Rural Dean Geddes, M. A., with the following address.—

To the Right Reverend the Lord Bishop of Toronto :

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR LORDSHIP:—

We, the undersigned Clergy of your Lordship's Diocese, avail ourselves of the opportunity afforded by our assembling at your Lordship's visitation, to express our profound regret at the painful anxiety which has been occasioned to yourself, and the great injury which has been done to the Church, by the suspicion which has been groundlessly and wantonly cast upon the organizations of the Church and the general teaching of the Clergy within this Diocese.

We maintain that the publication or dissemination of objectionable manuals, whether of doctrine or devotion, or the irregularities of individuals among the Clergy in the conduct of Divine service, can furnish no excuse for the sweeping and indiscriminate charges which have repeatedly been made in the tracts of the Church Association of the Diocese of Toronto; and that men who really value and love the doctrine and discipline of the Church would feel themselves bound to direct their attacks against the individual offenders, rather than against the great body to which those who may thus offend are a weakness and disgrace. And we beg to assure your Lordship that, in exercising discipline on any who are justly open to such attacks, you will be supported by the sympathy of the great body of your Clergy, no less than by that of the Laity of the Diocese.

We hold that it is a most sacred obligation of the Clergy fearlessly and without reserve to inculcate the doctrines, and to observe the instructions of the Church, as they are plainly set forth in the Book of Common Prayer, claiming to themselves no larger liberty than has been accorded to them either by the direct appointment or by the established usage of the Church of England; and we cannot but feel that a most grievous hindrance has been thrown in the way of those whose honest purpose it is thus to fulfill the vows taken at their ordination, by publications which most effectually, if not studiously, confound truth with error, and identify a faithful discharge of our ministerial obligations with a self-willed and disloyal departure from the principles of our Reformed Church.

(Signed),

1. J. GAMBLE GEDDES, M. A., Rector of Hamilton, and Rural Dean.
2. F. L. OSLER, M. A., Rector and Rural Dean, Dundas.
3. JOHN WILSON, M. A., Rector and Rural Dean, Grafton.
4. STEPHEN LETY, D. D., LL. D., Rector and Rural Dean, Collingwood.
5. WILLIAM McMURRAY, D. D., D.C.L., Rector and Rural Dean, Niagara.
6. GEORGE WHITAKER, M. A., Provost of Trinity College.

7. JOHN BELL WORRELL, M.A., Oakville.
8. C. E. THOMSON, M.A., Rector and Rural Dean, Elora.
9. HENRY HOLLAND, B. A., Rector of St. Catharines.
10. D. I. F. MACLEOD, M.A., Chippawa.
11. HENRY SCADDING, D.D. Cantab., Toronto.
12. W. STEWART DARLING, Rector-Assistant, Holy Trinity Church, Toronto.
13. VINCENT CLEMENTI, B.D., North Douro, Peterborough.
14. JOHN CARRY, B.D., Credit.
15. J. H. MCCOLLUM, M.A., St. Thomas, Toronto.
16. T. B. FULLER, D.D., D.C.L., Archdeacon of Niagara.
17. T. BOLTON READ, D.D., D.C.L., Canon and Rector of Grimsby.
18. HENRY BRENT, M.A., Canon and Rector of Clarke.
19. HENRY B. OSLER, Canon and Rector of York Mills.
20. ALEXANDER DIXON, B.A., Rector of Port Dalhousie, and Canon.
21. WALTER STENNETT, M.A., Rector of Cobourg.
22. A. J. BROUGHALL, M.A., St. Stephen's; Honorary Clerical Secretary.
23. F. TREMAYNE, M.A., Newmarket.
24. JOHN DAVIDSON, M.A., Uxbridge.
25. H. W. DAVIES, D.D., Assistant, Holy Trinity Church, Toronto.
26. WILLIAM LOGAN, M.A., Fenelon Falls.
27. CHAS. LYCESTER INGLES, M.A., Rector of Stamford.
28. WILLIAM GRANT, M.A., Tullamore.
29. G. H. HOOPER, Glenallan.
30. THOMAS BALL, Bond Head.
31. T. T. ROBERTS, M.A., Rector of Thorold.
32. CHAS. J. S BETHUNE, M.A., Head Master of Trinity College School.
33. E. H. COLE, M.A., Whitby.
34. GEORGE A. BULL, M.A., Barton.
35. STEWART HOUSTON, M.A., Waterdown.
36. ALEX. WILLIAMS, M.A., St. John's, Toronto.
37. J. MCLEAN BALLARD, M.A., St. Bartholomew's, Toronto.
38. RICHARD HARRISON, M.A., St. Matthias, Toronto.
39. EDWARD MORGAN, M.A., Rector of Barrie.
40. J D'ARCY CAYLEY, M.A., Assistant Minister St. George's Church, Toronto.
41. JOHN LANGTRY, M.A., Incumbent St. Luke's, Toronto.
42. W. T. SMITHETT, D.D., Rural Dean, Lindsay.
43. ARTHUR BOULTBEE, Harriston.
44. GEORGE I. TAYLOR, B.A., Cannington.
45. CHAS. W. PATERSON, B.C.L., St. Mark's, Port Hope.
46. OGDEN B. FORD, B.A., Church of the Holy Trinity, Toronto.
47. C. R. BELL, Mus. Bac., Brooklin.
48. W. J. MACKENZIE, Mount Forest.
49. JOHN AMBERY, M.A., Professor, Trinity College, Toronto.
50. JOHN FLETCHER, M.A., Highland Creek.
51. WILLIAM BELT, M.A., Oshawa.
52. I. MIDDLETON, B.A., Brampton.
53. WILLIAM JONES, M.A., Professor, Trinity College, Toronto.
54. A. G. L. TREW, M.A., Christ's Church, York.
55. JOHN H. FLETCHER, Nanticoke.
56. JOSEPH FLETCHER, B.A., Shanty Bay.
57. WILLIAM MASSEY, B.A., Lowville.
58. CHARLES RUTTAN, Berkeley and Chester.
59. W. R. FORSTER, Creemore.
60. JOHN GRIBBLE, Port Colborne.
61. LAWRENCE A. KIRKBY, Batteau.
62. G. A. ANDERSON, M.A., Penetanguishene.
63. W. M. C. CHARKE, Alliston.
64. ALEXANDER W. MACNAB, St. Catharines.
65. R. G. SUTHERLAND, Hamilton.
66. FINLOW ALEXANDER, M. D, Guelph.
67. T. W. PATERSON, B.A., Bradford.

68. N. C. MARTIN, B.A., Norval.
69. THOMAS G. PORTER, Georgetown.
70. A. J. FIDLER, B.A., Aurora.
71. T. P. HODGE, York Mills.
72. W. H. CLARKE, B.A., Bolton.
73. E. HORACE MUSSEN, B.A., Clifton.
74. E. W. MURPHY, B.A., Innisfil.
75. P. L. SPENCER, Wellington Square.
76. M. A. FARRAR, M.A., Westwood.
77. THOMAS J. HODGKIN, M.D., Woodbridge.
78. GEORGE S. J. HILL, M.A., Rector of Markham and Rural Dean.
79. ALEXANDER HENDERSON, B.A., Incumbent of Orangeville.
80. MARK BURNHAM, B.A., Otonabee.
81. T. H. M. BARTLETT, M.A., Chaplain of the Forces (retired).

His Lordship delivered the following reply :—

MY DEAR AND REVEREND BRETHREN,—I thank you very sincerely for the address you have presented to me. In receiving this expression of sympathy and promise of support from so many of our influential and experienced clergy, I feel much encouraged in the endeavour to stay those reckless proceedings on the part of some of our brethren which tend so seriously to destroy the peace of the Church, and hinder her prosperity and usefulness.

We shall continue to do our duty with God's blessing and assistance, and not relax in our prayers for those who—misguided, though they may be, and conscientious—are labouring with so much zeal to thwart our humble yet earnest efforts to advance truth and righteousness in the sphere of duty in which God has placed us

THE SUPPORT OF THE CLERGY, AND OUR MISSIONARY WORK.

To the Lay Members of the Church of England in the Diocese of Toronto.

MY DEAR BRETHREN,

At this period of the year many anxieties press upon me in reference to the welfare of our beloved Church ; and for the relief of these anxieties I feel that I cannot do better than address my appeal to the Lay members of our communion for their sympathy and aid. The two prominent subjects of anxious concern are, THE SATISFACTORY SUPPORT OF THE CLERGY, and THE EXTENSION OF OUR MISSIONARY WORK.

I shall, first, freely lay my anxieties before you on the subject of

THE SATISFACTORY SUPPORT OF THE CLERGY.

Through a protracted but praiseworthy effort we have reached this happy conclusion—that the stipend of every clergyman in Priest's Orders in this Diocese should not be less than \$800 per annum—an advance of \$200 upon what had antecedently been required as the maximum of income. This we hailed as a gratifying recognition of what was due to our hard-worked clergy ; for, although not all we should wish as the amount of their yearly salary, it is a hopeful augury of better things at a future day.

But I regret to say that, as quarter-days come about, and I have to confer with the Secretary-Treasurer of the Synod on the pay-list of

the quarterly dues to our Missionary clergy, there are always some cases of default laid before me. This, I am happy to say, is an exception to the rule ; yet it creates a serious amount of inconvenience to the clergyman, especially since not even the Mission Board's quota can be sent until the congregation's share of the promised stipend be in the hands of the Secretary-Treasurer.

After anxious inquiries into the cause of this, I have discovered that, in most instances, it is owing to the fact that no one has taken the trouble to collect this stipend. This duty is fairly considered as belonging to the Churchwardens for the time being ; and Churchwardens, in some places, no doubt find the work irksome and onerous enough. But all should feel that it is a great privilege to be doing some work, however humble it be, for Christ ; and what is done for his Church and his ministers is done for Him. It is a privilege to any of His disciples to feel that not only can he give of his *substance* towards the support of the Gospel, but that he has the opportunity of contributing a little of his time and energies for that purpose. And if the business and claims of the world are so exacting as to leave no time for this purpose, it would be possible, I trust, for the Churchwardens thus hampered to obtain the services of some friend or friends to do this really important duty for them, so as to exempt the anxious, perhaps suffering, clergyman from the serious inconvenience which delay in collecting the stipulated salary occasions. I hope, then, that these suggestions will be acted upon. But I would further remark that much trouble and inconvenience would be saved if the several subscribers to the clergyman's stipend would send their dues at the stated periods to the Churchwardens ; or place them, enclosed in an envelope, on the plate in church when the ordinary alms and offerings are collected. They might be marked "For Clergyman's Stipend," with the name of the contributor. This plan, I hear, is in some cases adopted, and with much success.

But our congregations are all aware that we need and expect more from them than merely the payment of the stipend they have specially guaranteed. We look to them, as well, for the supply of the means by which our Mission Board dispenses its quarterly benefactions to Missionary parishes. This Board is called upon to dispense about \$16,000 per annum amongst the several Missions of the Diocese ; and the applications for help are steadily increasing. As the more remote and uncultivated parts of the Province become peopled, there is a renewed demand on us for spiritual aid to those places ; and it is hard to calculate how many new Missions will soon have to be opened in the fast settling townships in the rear of the counties of Peterborough and Victoria. You will understand, then, the anxiety we naturally feel on

THE EXTENSION OF OUR MISSIONARY WORK.

In order to keep up the Missions already established until they become independent of outward aid, and to construct the new ones that are being continually required, we make our annual appeal to you for contributions to the Mission Fund. We tell you, year by year, through our Deputations, what is the extent of the harvest of souls it is our duty to gather in ; how many labourers we need for that purpose ; and how much is required for the sustenance of those labourers.

In glancing over the annual collections made for this purpose in the different parishes, and the amount of individual contributions, I confess a frequent disappointment in observing that, in most cases, there is no excess in one year above what was given in the previous one—that it has been a sort of stereotyped benefaction; that it does not appear to have been measured by the extent of the actual demand, nor by any fitting consideration of the extent to which in that year God has prospered them. By your giving in this proportion, we should be encouraged to extend our work, and give life and cultivation, with God's blessing, to places that are now spiritually barren. Would there be any difficulty, I venture to ask in doubling, in many cases the old limit of annual contribution? Would it not be easy, in most cases, to add a half to the amount that had previously been given? Should God, in his goodness, continue to this land the prosperity which during many past years has been experienced, it will be refreshing and inspiring to feel that He is making good his promise to those who by such gifts are lending to Him,—“that which they have given him, will he pay them again.”

But I am required my brethren, to advert to another obligation in view of your awakened responsibility in regard to our Missionary work. We are bound to contemplate it in its widening space and its increasing demands. It is our duty to look past our own communities—to overstep our own special sphere of spiritual work—in contemplation of the whitening harvest beyond, and the scantiness of labourers to gather it in. Let us not fail to bear in affectionate memory

THE DIOCESE OF ALGOMA

Which was, until recently, part of the sphere of our Missionary work. Let the fact be borne in mind that it is essentially a *Missionary Diocese*, and that it relies for its maintenance almost exclusively upon the aid it may receive from the other Dioceses within our ecclesiastical Province. It must be apparent to all that they are not in a position to support from their own resources their Bishop and Clergy; and it is evident that, for carrying on the good work before them, they must be assisted for several years to come.

The quota pledged by the Diocese of Toronto towards their aid is \$2,400 per annum—not much more than the outlay on their behalf when they were part of our own. It has become necessary that the Fund applied to the assistance of the Diocese of Algoma should be kept distinct from our own Mission Fund, and that the amount pledged by our Diocese should be raised specially and independently for that object.

And I have further to remind you that our Synod at its last session voted the sum of \$500 in aid of Missionary work in the

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA,

from the consideration that many of our own Province were making their home there, and that these must, for a time, need extraneous help in having the ministrations of the Church supplied to them. There was an additional reason for this contribution of aid, in the losses and privations that Province has been periodically enduring from the plague of grass-

hoppers, reducing them, in many cases, almost to the condition of famine.

I suggested, in my last address to the Synod of this Diocese, that the simplest and most equitable way of providing the sum thus required was to request the several parishes and missions of the Diocese to accept their share of this in the same proportion in which they are assessed annually for the expenses of the Synod. "The required disbursement"—I quote from that address—"for this good object would then be fairly distributed; and, being so diffused, would press but lightly upon each. Every parish, too, would thus be led to feel a special interest in the well-being of Algoma; and, believing that the quota of each would be cheerfully rendered, we should have the gratification of feeling that no special organization is needed, and that parishes will be spared the often embarrassing duty of keeping such organization at work."

Before the Synod rose a resolution passed commending the proposed arrangement to the charge of the Mission Board; and at the meeting of this Board in August last, I was requested to issue an appeal to the parishes of the Diocese to contribute the required amount. That each may know the exact amount which is severally required of them, a list has been prepared which will accompany this my appeal.

After these statements which present channels for the employment to a pious and holy use of a portion of the worldly substance with which God has blessed you, let me add a few words of kindly exhortation in conclusion,

I must remind you, my brethren, that earthly possessions, be they large or small, are a stewardship committed to you for faithful and profitable occupation. No one must allow himself to think that he is to live only for himself: with no thought or effort beyond the gratification of self. This would be a sad employment of your stewardship as Christians—a wretched preparation for rendering an account of it at the last day.

As that day draws nigh to each, it would be with a heavy and trembling heart that you looked back upon days and years spent only in selfish indulgences; with hardly a thought, with scarcely a sacrifice of time or means, for the cause of the Redeemer. It would be sad to contemplate all the past as a waste—not a deep place filled, not a stone of stumbling put out of the way, in preparation for the coming of the Lord. But there will be to you a cheer and joy in renewing efforts for the spread of the Redeemer's kingdom—for making hills and valleys glad with the tidings of salvation; for spreading its announcement to every lone place, to every void and aching heart.

Every holy and dutiful service, every labour of Christian love, every alms-deed and offering thrown into the Missionary treasury, is, under God, a humble yet efficient instrument in bringing about that grand and glorious purpose. May God give you grace so to view it, and may He preserve you from the sin and danger of slighting so great an obligation and so high a privilege.

I remain, dear Brethren,

Your faithful friend and Diocesan,

A. N. TORONTO.

Toronto, December 26, 1874.

DETAIL OF ASSESSMENTS FOR THE DIOCESE OF TORONTO.

Amaranth and Mono.....	\$8	Gwillimbury, East	\$10
Ancaster, Dundas, and West Flamborough.....	16	Gwillimbury, West	15
Alliston.....	6	Gore's Landing	10
Aurora, Oak Ridges, and King	16	Hamilton, Christ Church...	30
Barrie	20	“ Ascension	30
Barton and Glanford	16	“ St. Thomas.....	30
Batteau	8	“ All Saints'	20
Beamsville.....	6	Hastings and Alnwick	10
Berkeley and Chester	15	Innisfil	15
Beverley	10	Lindsay	25
Bobcaygeon and Dunsford...	12	Lloydtown.....	15
Bolton and Sandhill	15	Louth and Port Dalhousie...	20
Brampton	16	Lowville, Nassagaweya, and Carlisle	15
Brooklin and Columbus ...	8	Mauvers	16
Brock and Beaverton	16	Markham, St. Philip's, ...	15
Caledonia and York	16	“ Grace Church....	10
Cameron	6	Merritton	10
Carleton	8	Milton and Hornby	16
Cartwright	15	Minden	8
Cavan	25	Minto	10
Cayuga	15	Mount Forest and North Arthur	15
Chippawa	20	Mulmur.....	15
Clifton	10	Mulmur, West	6
Clarke	20	Newmarket	16
Cobourg.....	40	Niagara	20
Coldwater	10	North Douro.....	12
Collingwood	16	North Essa	16
Cookstown.....	16	North Orillia and Medonte.	6
Credit	16	Norval and Stewart-town...	10
Colborne and Brighton.....	15	Norwood and Westwood ...	10
Darlington.....	20	Oakville.....	20
Dunnville	15	Omagh and Palermo.....	10
Dysart	6	Orangeville	20
Elora.....	15	Orillia	20
Emily and Ennismore	15	Oshawa	20
Erin	10	Otonabee	10
Etobicoke	20	Penetanguishene, St. James's	12
Fenelon Falls.....	15	“ and Wyebridge	8
Fergus	15	Perrytown and South Mon- aghan.....	12
Fort Erie	15	Peterborough	40
Georgetown	15	Pickering	10
Georgina	15	Port Colborne	15
Glenallan	6	Port Hope, St. John's	40
Grafton	15	Port Hope, St. Mark's.....	20
Grantham	10	Port Perry.....	16
Grimsby	20	Rockwood.....	8
Guelpb	45		

Rothsay and Huston.....	\$10	Toronto, St. Peter's	\$40
Saltfleet and Binbrook	8	“ St. Luke's	15
Saltfleet under the Mountain	6	“ Ch. of the Redeemer	25
Scarborough	16	“ All Saints	20
Seymour and Percy	16	“ St. Matthias	10
Shanty Bay	10	“ St. Thomas.....	10
Stamford	16	“ St. Bartholomew...	10
Stayner and Creemore.....	15	“ Grace Church.....	10
Streetsville	12	Uxbridge	16
St. Catharines, St. George's	40	Walpole.....	12
“ Christ's Ch..	20	Walpole, South.....	12
Tecumseth.....	16	Waterdown	16
Thornhill & Richmond Hill.	20	Welland and Fonthill	15
Thorold	20	Wellington Square and Nel-	
Tullamore	15	son	15
Toronto, St. James's Cath...	125	Weston	10
“ St. Paul's	40	Whitby	20
“ Trinity	30	Woodbridge and Vaughan..	15
“ St. George's	50	York Mills	16
“ Holy Trinity.....	50	York Township, Christ Ch.	16
“ St. John's	20	Trinity College, Toronto ...	15
“ St. Stephen's.....	25	Trinity College School, Port	
“ St. Anne's	15	Hope	15

STANDING COMMITTEES OF SYNOD.

The Regular Quarterly Meetings of the Standing Committees of Synod will be held at the Synod Office, Toronto, on Thursday and Friday, 11th and 12th February, 1875:—

Clergy Trust Committee.	Thursday.....	11 A.M.
Land Committee.	“	1 P.M.
Widows and Orphans' Fund Committee.	“	1 P.M.
Executive Committee.	“	3 P.M.
Sunday School, &c.	“	4 P.M.
Church Music.	“	7 P.M.
Mission Board.	Friday	10 A.M.
Audit Committee.	“	1 P.M.
General Purposes Fund Committee.	“	2 P.M.
Printing Committee.	“	4 P.M.

Synod Office, Toronto, February 1st, 1875.

Wm. P. ATKINSON, *Secretary.*

Official Acknowledgments.

COLLECTIONS, SUBSCRIPTIONS, AND DONATIONS RECEIVED FROM DECEMBER 1st, 1874, TO JANUARY 31st, 1875, INCLUSIVE.

MISSION FUND

January Collection.

Barton \$5 00; Glanford \$3 00; Barton East \$2 00; Grimsby \$7 00; Woodbridge \$1 25; Toronto—St. James' \$27 50, St. Anne's \$4 34, St. George's \$64 00, St. Bartholomew's \$3 45, St. Paul's, \$20 00; Weston \$1 44; Carleton \$2 00; Guelph \$23 34; Puslinch \$1 00; Erin \$2 63; Hillsburgh \$1 57; Reading 63c; Welland \$5.60; Fonthill \$6 15; Bobcaygeon \$2 50; Dunsford \$1 00; Hastings 54c; Alnwick \$1 00; York Township—Christ Church \$5 90; Hamilton—Ascension \$14 53; Grafton \$6 00; Clifton \$5 00; Duffin's Creek 54c; Greenwood 46c; North Esau—Ivy \$1 60; Thornton 58c, Ballynascreeen 82c; Cayuga \$15 75; Credit \$1 19, Dixie \$1 40, Port Credit \$1 31; Port Hope, St. John's \$6 65; West Mulmur—Whitfield 50c;

Thorold \$8 05; Port Robinson \$1 45; Cobourg—St. Peter's \$43 13; Amaranth \$1 86; Barrie \$13 00; Coldwater \$1 00; Waverley \$1 00; Craighurst \$2 00; Bolton \$2 60; Sand Hill \$1 17; St. Catharines—St. George's \$16 42; Fort Erie \$6 00; Bowmanville \$6 00, Woodbourne (1874) \$1 00.

Thanksgiving Collection.

Port Hope—Trinity College School Chapel \$14 40; Lloydtown \$4 57; Alliston—St. Peter's \$2 00; North Douro \$11 87; Merriton \$1 25; Tecumseth—St. John's, additional \$1 62; Clarksville \$1 12; Contents of Lucy Burrell's Missionary Box \$4 15; Norwood 75c; Westwood \$1 25; Guelph \$26 11; Clifton \$2 50; Toronto—St. John's \$11 44; Medonte—St. George's \$1 65; Port Perry \$5 50; York \$1 58; Otonabee \$22 00; Shanty Bay \$5 11; Toronto—St. Paul's \$30 00.

July Collection.—Toronto—St. Paul's \$50 00.

Collections at Missionary Meetings and Services.

Fonthill \$5 00; Virgil \$2 85 Queenston \$2 15; Glenallan \$9 15; Thorold \$11 00, Port Robinson \$7 45; Dysart—St. George's \$2 50 Ascension 43c. Grantham \$3 85; Merriton \$3 90, Homer \$4 25; Rothsay \$3 00, Huston \$3 75; Stamford \$8 82, Stamford Sunday School Box \$1 00; Drummondville \$6 50; Colborne \$6 01; Brighton \$2 68; Credit \$5 27; Dixie \$5 21, Port Credit \$1 14; Waverley \$2 00 Craighurst \$3 00; St. Catharines—St. George's \$27 50.

Parochial Collections.—Cartwright (1873-4) \$14 50.

Offertory at Synod Service, St. George's Toronto, December 29th, 1874, \$9 90.

WIDOWS AND ORPHANS' FUND.

October Collection.

Cannington \$10 00, Beaverton \$1 50, West Brock 50c; Newcastle (additional) \$4; Port Hope—Trinity College School Chapel \$12 58; Alliston \$3 00, West Essa \$1 75, Angus \$2 25; North Douro \$17 78; Toronto—St. James's (additional) \$25 00, St. Peter's \$74 55, St. John's \$10 00; Clifton (additional) \$9 00; Etobicoke (on account) \$26 25, Norwood \$3 15, Westwood \$7 30; Woodbourne \$1 49, Stony Creek 87c; Cameron 75c., East Ops 40c.; Tullamore—St. John's \$2 05, St. James' \$2 00, St. Mary's 68c.; Caledonia \$3 57, York \$3 60; Shanty Bay \$20 85, St. James' \$2 01, St. Mark's 50c., School House, 35c.

Annual Subscriptions.

Rev. W. M. C. Clarke \$5; Mrs. Leech \$5; Mrs. Jacobs \$5; Rev. Canon Ramsay \$5; Rev. F. J. S. Groves \$5.

COLLECTION ON DAY OF INTERCESSION, 2nd DECEMBER, 1874.

To be divided equally between the Dioceses of Algoma and Rupert's Land.

Toronto—St. James's Cathedral \$34 50, St. Paul's \$20, Trinity East \$8, St. George's, \$34 14, Holy Trinity \$25, St. John's \$13 54, St. Stephen's, \$4 66, St. Peter's \$22, St. Luke's \$16 25, St. Bartholomew's, \$7 79, Trinity College Chapel, \$7 90; York Mills \$3 93; Cobourg—St. Peter's, \$17 72; Newcastle \$8 36; Newmarket \$6 45; Port Hope—St. John's \$8 20; Trinity College School Chapel, \$8 56; Christ Church, York Township, \$20 38; Elora \$6 53; Rockwood 88c; Acton \$1 42; Ascension \$1 70; Cookstown \$5 30; Bolton \$5 57; North Essa—Christ Church \$1 30; Thorold \$12 47; Port Robinson \$7 41; Georgina—St. James's \$3 03, St. George's, \$1 75; Hamilton—Ascension \$10 50; Barton \$2 30; Glanford \$2 20; Barton East \$1 50; Orillia \$21 50; Grafton \$5 50; Stayner \$1 60; Creemore, \$1 40; North Douro \$6 39; Carleton, \$1 00; Hastings, \$1 20; Alawick \$2; Nanticoke, \$3 64; Cayuga \$4 40; Tecumseth—Trinity \$23 50, St. John's—\$4c; Penetanguishene—St. James's Church \$6; Etobicoke—Christ Church \$1, St. George's \$2 15; W. Mulmur, Whitfield, \$1; Coldwater—Waverley \$2 25, Craighurst \$3 75; Port Colborne \$5 50; Marshville \$1; Lowville \$2 56; Nassagaweya \$1 55; Carlisle 89c; Norwood and Westwood \$1 25; Guelph \$35 85; Cavan—St. John's \$3 53, St. Thomas's \$3 12; Weston—St. Philip's \$2 45; Barrie \$18; Fort Erie \$8 90; Clifton \$2; Peterborough \$14 32; Medonte—St. Luke's \$4 35; Aurora \$1 15; King \$1 50; Port Perry \$1; Shanty Bay \$1 35; Rothsay \$1 82; Huston 87c; Wellington Square \$7 80, Nelson \$3 60; Lloydton \$4 40; Dundas \$4; W. Flambrough \$4 50; Whithy \$8 50; Niagara \$6 53; St. Catharines—St. George's \$10 50, Christ Church \$15; Campbellford \$3; Orangeville \$2 30; Stamford \$3 72; Drummondville \$4 04; Otonabee \$10. (*To be continued in the next Number.*)