

to weigh the claims they had before thought unworthy of consideration. One proof of the effect of such attention is to be seen in the fact that bodies that were wont to denounce us as a half-way house to Rome are assuming those portions of our worship that seem to them most attractive, while in one case instituting in addition a mode of government having the same name as ours, but lacking the vital element of historic truth. These are the points that are going to help us with the thinking men of to-day—the fact of our having always worked under the duly appointed Constitution—how the Constitution of the Church is the New Testament—its best interpreters those who first worked under it. If we can show that our view is the same as theirs, it is a fair ground for assuming that we are right. This is our *defensive* position. But we have an offensive one as well, and that is to show, as I have before indicated, that those bodies which differ from us trace their method of interpretation to what is comparatively a very late date, and what is more, that those methods were more the results of the unavoidable circumstance in which their promulgators were placed than a real conviction of their being right. You will see at once that this narrows the field of our discussion. We deal not with essentials of faith, but with methods of organization, and, broadly speaking, it is in this that the main ground of differences lies, although with the Baptists the cause of division is mainly the interpretation of an article of that creed which they accept as well as ourselves. I say our differences lie not in

THE ESSENTIALS OF THE FAITH,

while Christian bodies use as their symbol the Apostles' Creed, there is, thank God, a ground of union. So far as doctrinal questions go, you can hear Calvinism preached in some of our pulpits, and the broadest theology in the nominally strictest denominations—e. g., the Andover School has sprung from the Congregational body—so when you come down to the real points of variance, you will find them summed up mainly in

METHODS OF GOVERNMENT,

and perhaps the minor point of forms of worship, and for the proof of this it is only necessary to note that of the four points essential for union laid down by the House of Bishops in 1866, the only one that met with dissent was the one proclaiming the *Historic Episcopate* as the essential form of church government. If we so agree on this, all else would follow, for if a man accepts the creeds unhesitatingly, then his opinions about such points as predestination, election, conversion and the like remain merely as his *opinion*; they cannot be made matters of faith, for they are not, neither ever have been, embodied in any universal creed of the Universal Church. But in discussing our differences as to church government, we must be sure of our ground; and by going into the origin of the great Christian bodies that surround us, we can, I think, sustain our contention that their principles are modern in origin and were more often the result of force of circumstances than of innate conviction, and this applies also to the *doctrinal* position of the Baptists. To sustain this contention is to give an adequate reason for our standing aloof from other Christian bodies, and by so doing we shall also help to shoulder a part of that responsibility that is on us to-day—when men's mind are turned towards us—of giving a reason for the hope that is in us, not as Christians, but as Churchmen. We are not asked to defend the creed, but to define and defend our interpretation of

WHAT THE CHURCH IS.

This, I repeat, can be done by contrasting our own historical continuity with the recent rise of the governing principles of the great Christian bodies. Among these, *three* stand out prominently.

[To be continued.]

CORRESPONDENCE.

"SHALL SHINGWAUK BE CLOSED?"

To the Editor of the Church Guardian:

SIR,—With tingling cheeks, with a thrill of surprise and shame, and with a feeling of deep sorrow, I read the Rev. E. F. Wilson's letter anent the impending closing of the Shingwauk Home.

I am sadly afraid that there are many people who look upon this work merely as a "hobby" of Mr. Wilson's; they do not at all realize that such Divine enthusiasm has taken hold upon him as to render him unable to rest until he has done his life work, to which I firmly believe God had called him. Surely it is the Holy Spirit who has borne in upon Mr. Wilson's soul the words, "It is not the will of your Heavenly Father that one of these little ones should perish."

Let us rally around Mr. Wilson, and give him our money, our sympathy and our prayers. Let us thank God when we find in our Apostolic Church, Apostolic Faith and Apostolic work in the person of such a man. I would that such zeal and enthusiasm were contagious, and that thousands at this time—for now is the time—were smitten with this "Indian fever." Let us thank God when we find a man or a woman who, in the spirit of self-abnegation, is praying, working, struggling and suffering, and who, under it all, courageously says: "This one thing I do." Yes, and let us come to Mr. Wilson's help, lest the Master say to us "Inasmuch as ye did it not to one of the least of these my brethren, ye did it not to Me."

Thank God that our Church in Canada is beginning to awake to her privileges and responsibilities. Yet it is sad to look over the Diocesan offertories, and to see how very little is being done for either Home or Foreign Missionary work. Let every congregation and every Sunday school increase its Missionary offerings; let us all make systematic and persistent efforts to swell the treasury of our "Board of Missions," and sweep away the burning shame of the pathetic cry that Mr. Wilson utters, "The Mission Board will not help me!"

Perhaps if Mr. Wilson's sad letter will not arouse the Church, perhaps if my own poor words are deemed an intrusion, perhaps the following words from an appreciative editorial in *The Mail*, of about three years since, will sting us into action. God grant that they may send us to our knees, to our pockets, to the Harvest Field, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

The following is the excerpt:—

"It is very curious that the Church of England, which in England contributes in a princely manner to Missions both at home and abroad, should in this country give much less in proportion to its strength than any other Christian body towards the spread of the Gospel among the heathen of this and other lands. One is at a loss to account for this, unless indeed it be that the Canadian Church has for so long received of the bounty of the Church in England that it has come to regard itself rather as an object of charity than as a source from which liberal gifts should come. The Church of England has among its members some of the wealthiest men in Canada, and it has a tremendous membership of people who may be described as in comfortable circumstances. From such a source it should derive a large revenue for mission purposes. That it requires such a revenue no one can deny."

"An object of charity!" Stinging words. Yet, "faithful are the wounds of a friend." True, the Church is doing more than she did a few years ago. Yet, she is only "playing at Missions" as yet. Oh, let every baptized believer, who should, in some sense, be a missionary, heed the great Shepherd's voice, "Lovest thou Me? Feed my Sheep. Lovest thou Me? Feed my Lambs."

I pray that our dear brother's heart may be cheered in the work for which he has for so long laboured and suffered, by the Church arousing herself and saying, "You shall not close even a part of your Homes; here are the funds." Amen.

"O'er all Earth's broad domain,
On our Canadian shore,
We see Thy finger pointing plain
To each wide open door;
And if we turn our eyes away,
Lord, wilt Thou own us in that day?"

Baptize with holy fire
Each heart before Thee now!
Kindle fresh zeal and new desire;
With life our soul's endow;
Then shall Thy Church arise and shine,
And Earth rejoice in power Divine."

Yours, etc.,

W. J. TAYLOR.

St. James Rectory, St. Mary's, Sept. 26, 1890.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We are obliged again to make an urgent appeal to our Subscribers to pay up arrears. Some of them now owe for years: others only for a year or two. The amount, small in each case, reaches a sum sufficient to impede us in our work; and renders the service done to The Church in continuing the publication of the CHURCH GUARDIAN, without remuneration to the Editor, more burdensome than it need be. Some subscribers too, (we regret to say) after receiving the paper for several years, now strive by all manner of excuses to escape payment. But we must and shall insist on payment of arrears before any order for discontinuance will be obeyed.

But more than this, may we not ask that all who really desire that there should be an impartial and sound Church paper maintained,—free from extremes and reflecting we believe the true principles of The Church as we are assured the GUARDIAN has done and does—will take interest enough in it to endeavor to secure new subscribers; and that those who have business announcements to make will favor us with their advertisements? Were the matter merely a *personal* one—that is were the GUARDIAN carried on for mere *personal* benefit—we would make no such appeal as this. Amid a multitude of other engagements—public and private—and whilst engaged in an arduous and exacting profession, the Editor has employed time which should have gone to recreation and rest in carrying on this distinctly *Church* work; and we hope that more than in the past we may have the hearty support and influence of Clergy and Laity.

MANY plausible attacks upon the Christian creed are due to the inadequate methods of its professed interpreters. Fragments of doctrine torn from their context and deprived of their due proportions, are brandished in the eyes of men by well meaning but ignorant apologists as containing the sum total of the Christian faith, with the lamentable consequence that even earnest seekers after truth, and much more its unearnest and merely factious adversaries, mislead themselves and others into thinking Christianity discredited, when in reality they have all along been criticizing its caricature. Such men need reminding that Christianity is greater than its isolated interpreters or misinterpreters in any age; that in the course of its long history it has accumulated answers to many an objection which they in their ignorance think new; and that, in the confidence of its universal mission and the memory of its many victories, it still claims to be sympathetic, adequate, adaptable to the problems and perplexities of each successive age.—
Rev. J. R. Illingsworth.