

It was in the spring of 1889 that the foundation was built, and the stone laid by Lady Stanley. All the stone that will be required is on the premises ready to be used.

When I came at the close of July last that was all that was done, as all the money that was collected had been spent to pay for what was done. A new man in a new place can do but little until he knows something of the work before him. However I began to collect, although late in the season. I found the population very small, under a hundred, and only about twenty out of that number I can claim as members of our Church here. They have contributed nearly all the money that has been spent, and as times are very dull here, I cannot see that they can give much more. We want at least another \$1000 with the \$550 we have in hand.

The spring has come, and the summer with its visitors will soon be here to see the grand sights which nature has left us. I found the majority of the visitors both from England, the United States, and Canada, were Church people. At first, I used the Pavilion, then I fitted up a small building as churchy as I could, which suited the inhabitants, but was and will be again too small when the visitors arrive. In the evening I held services with the kind permission of Mr. Matthews, the manager at the C. P. R. Hotel, and I hope to do so again until our church is built, before the visitors arrive, and to do so we ought to begin to build right away. But we are unable to do any more until we have more funds. Thus, I am earnestly asking the many friends of our Church, far and near, who may visit this park, to help us in our hour of need: as it is a standing shame to see this foundation exposed winter after winter to the frost. There are several things which we will require, for instance, a bell, and I can get a good one for \$100. How thankful we would be if some kind friend and well-wisher of Banff would send us such a gift. A pulpit, not large, as the church will only seat 250. A reading desk for the priest. A font, wood or stone, and a set of Holy Communion vessels. A lectern has been given. We have an organ which will suit as for the present.

The Bishop of Calgary will gladly receive any monies or gifts for this object; or my church warden, Captain Harper, Banff, or myself.

W. J. WILLIAMS, Incumbent, Banff, N. W. T., Canada.

April, 1891.

### The Appointment to Vacant Parishes.

#### THE IRISH SYSTEM CONSIDERED.

SIR.—I promised in last week's issue to consider now the Irish system, which consists of a Board of Nomination.

The bishop is the presiding officer and has an independent and a casting vote. Three diocesan nominators and three parochial nominators.

The three diocesan nominators are elected every three years by the diocesan synod, and consists of one layman and two clergymen. The statute gives the power to call for a vote by orders—the laity for the laymen and the clergy for the two clergymen.

The three parochial nominators are elected also triennially. At the Easter general meeting of each parish every nominator has to sign a declaration that he is a member of the Church and a communicant, and that he will nominate the best man from worthy motives, &c.

Canon Henderson prefers this system. He sums up its disadvantages and advantages as follows:—  
“Disadvantages.—Has it any?—Yes. Canvassing the Committee.

“Advantages.—(1) It recognizes the right of all parties concerned. (2) It is more likely to lead to a harmonious result. (3) It accords most closely with the apostolic plan.”

The system in my opinion may work well in Ireland, where party lines are not strongly drawn as they are now in Niagara; and yet a prominent Irish clergyman expresses his opinion of the practical working of the system as follows:—

“This system is found to lay stress on the parochial side of the question at the expense of the clerical and diocesan. The parochial nominators push themselves to the front and the sole idea in their minds is to get a man—no matter where he comes from or what his age may be—who will be useful and popular in the parish. The diocesan nominators are supposed to have some regard to the interests of the diocesan clergy, but they do not in general interfere when the parochial nominators have fixed upon a good man. The bishop has more influence, and when he is on the alert and takes pains to conciliate and advise with the parochial nominators and shows that he really feels the importance of doing what is best for the people, he can generally control the appointment; but of course he must be prepared for being sometimes thwarted when he has such a limited voice. This system has a strong tendency to keep in the background the best men, who will never thrust themselves forward.”

I fear very much that no system will lead to a harmonious result in some cases. A cranky congregation and one in which party lines are strongly drawn will only recognize the choice of such board when it respects the wishes of the parochial nominators.

Canon Henderson says that this system accords most closely with the apostolic plan. If Canon Henderson can spare the time we should all, I am quite sure, be pleased to see a letter from his able pen explaining the apostolic practice. In another letter I shall be pleased to set forth the various systems in vogue in Canada, and touch the weak sides of each.

NIAGARA.

### Notes and Queries.

SIR. In the Ninth Article it is said original sin standeth not in the following of Adam (as Pelagians do vainly talk); but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, &c., &c. We know that our blessed Lord was miraculously engendered, and hence He had not original sin, nor did He commit actual sin. Whence, then, had He a liability to err? Was it alone in the freedom of “human will” which He possessed, “enshrined in a spotless human body, produced by the power of the Holy Ghost,” or, was there a something according to nature in this body, which of itself (or in combination with the “human will”) would produce the liability?

F.

Ans. It is not in accordance with the Catholic Faith to believe that Christ was at any time liable to err intelligently, morally, or spiritually. It is true that He was man, but He was “without sin” in every form, because at the same time He was “perfect God.” We can never view His condition or acts without this consciousness that the hypostatic union is complete and permanent, so that nothing can come at any time between the two natures in the one Divine Person to estrange His human will or allow it to err. The question came up in the Colenso controversy, and is treated with some fulness by Canon Liddon in his Bampton Lectures.

SIR.—Would you be kind enough to answer these two questions for me:

1. Why are evening communions “abominable”? Were they not common in the times of the Apostles? I am greatly puzzled by the objection people have to them and I shall be very glad if you will enlighten me.

2. Does the 55th Canon (1603) allow extempore prayer during Divine Service? “Preachers and Ministers shall move the people to join with them in prayer in this form, or to this effect,” &c. I do not quite see whether this means the preacher shall move them or shall pray in this form or to this effect; I do not think what follows shows which, especially the last words seem to make it doubtful.

N. C. E.

Ans.—We do not endorse the word “abominable” as applied to evening celebrations of the Holy Communion *per se*. They may take place at any hour of the day or night when necessity calls for them, privately as in the case of the sick or infirm, or publicly in the face of an impending calamity. What is “abominable” about them is the wanton breach of the Church's rule which provides for what is intended to be the regular practice, viz., morning celebration. It is very objectionable to make what is only exceptionally allowable under extraordinary circumstances, a rule without competent authority, i. e., the authority of the Church as distinguished from that of any individual Bishop or Priest. We do not think it shows a proper regard for the discipline of the Church, while it ignores the reasons assigned by great and holy men of times past why celebrations of the Holy Communion should be held in the morning, and, preferably, in the early morning. Scripture example and history (witness Pliny's letter to Trajan) even the first institution of the Lord's Supper, show that the latter was the custom. The reasons given are that the early morning is the time when one's powers are restored, a time of freshness and calm, conducive to devotion, a time when one may make the Divine food the first that is partaken of—a thought worthy a Christian. To offer ourselves, our bodies a living sacrifice unto God, after they have been exhausted by toil, cares and worries of the day, is not to know God as we ought, by giving Him in His Holy Sacrament of our best, poor though it be. Moreover it is meet that the whole day should be consecrated to God's Service by offering Him the most solemn act of worship at the beginning.

2. We take it that the words “or to this effect” do not refer either to a form of prayer, or to extempore prayer; certainly not to the latter, as there would be no response for the people to join in what they were ignorant of, not knowing what

prayer was to be made. It can hardly be supposed that a canon would be enacted to get people to join mentally in an extempore prayer, and it would be mere tautology, did the words refer to those just preceding. We think “or to this effect” refers to some action to be taken by the preachers and ministers, to secure privately, or by indirect means, that the people join in the service by audibly making the responses, and repeating aloud with the minister such parts as are indicated by the Rubrics, as a substitute for publicly moving them to do so, by words of exhortation.

### Sunday School Lesson.

Trinity Sunday.

May 24, 1891.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

In a former lesson the Creed was compared to a banner leading the Christian Army. Now, as an army grows larger, the old flag may become insufficient, perhaps all cannot see it. So a larger one is provided, and still another when needed. The pattern is still the same, only more distinct. At first the Apostles' Creed was enough for the Church, but when men began to deny Christ's Divinity she held up a new banner—the Nicene Creed—in which the part relating to His Godhead was made larger and more distinct. Then other errors crept in, and it became necessary to have still another, the *Athanasian Creed*, so that all might know truly and clearly what the Faith was, for which they were to “earnestly contend.” (S. Jude 3; 1 S. Peter iii. 15).

Note.—The chants, etc., are to be “said or sung,” these creeds are to be “sung or said” (See Rubrics), as though saying were preferable.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

This Creed is more than fourteen hundred years old, and is called after Athanasius, because he was a great champion of the orthodox doctrines contained in it. He contended against Arius, who denied that the Lord Jesus was God; and this Creed is directed against the Arian heresy, amongst others.

The Apostles' Creed declared the facts about Christ's life and death on earth, but when men speculated about His life in heaven, before the Incarnation, they began to make mistakes. The truths about His Divine Nature are therefore stated more clearly in the *Athanasian Creed*.

THE CONTENTS OF THE CREED.

(1) *The necessity of the Christian faith.* (vv. 1, 2, 28, 42). These verses proclaim faith in Christ to be necessary to salvation. The Apostles preached this doctrine (Acts xvi. 31.) The Lord Himself declares the punishment of those who refuse to believe in Him (S. Mark xvi. 16), and even says that they are condemned already (S. John iii. 19). S. John puts the “unbelieving” second on the list of the doomed (Rev. xxi. 8). The Church dares not hide these terrible statements, but she declares them in mercy, that all may be warned in time. She does not judge any man! Christ will do that, and we know that He is loving and merciful. We can surely trust Him to make every allowance possible. Of course these words do not apply to those who have no opportunity of knowing about Christ. They will be judged by another law (Rom. ii. 12-16).

(2) *Doctrine of the Trinity* (xv. 3-27). Most people would be greatly confused without some such statement as is contained in these verses. They read in the Bible that there is only one God. Again, they find texts which prove that the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. How can they reconcile these seeming contradictions? This Creed pieces together the facts, which are scattered through the Bible, so that we may know what to believe. The Church did not defend the doctrine of the Trinity until it was attacked. In the third century Sabellius and his followers said that there was only one Person in the Godhead, revealing Himself in three different aspects. This made the statement of the fourth and fifth verses necessary. The Creed does not attempt to explain the nature of God, which is beyond our understanding. We, who cannot understand our own nature, can hardly expect to fathom the mystery of our Maker. No one but a fool would refuse to believe a thing only because he cannot understand it. We cannot understand even the ordinary course of the world, how the plants grow from little seeds, etc.

(3) *The Work of Jesus Christ* (vv. 29-40.) Arius said that Christ was the best of men, but not God. Verse 38 asserts His equality with the Father. Apollinaris started another heresy, viz., that He was truly God but not truly Man, having a body, but no human soul. Verse 32 is directed against this error, which would deprive us of the real human sympathy of our Master. His human soul was tempted in all points that he might “be touched with the feeling of our infirmities” (Heb. ii. 18, iv 15). A very valuable illustration of the union of