

"I must not conclude without one word about the Bishop-elect. There is no doubt, I think, that Archdeacon Sweatman will make an excellent Bishop, and that his presence among the sorely wounded and divided Churchmen of Toronto will be a healing presence. He is a fine scholar, a gentleman of very refined feeling, very loveable, I am assured; and certain it is that he will be as far removed as any one can be from the *violence and wild vagaries* of the Church Association. He has now been fourteen years in Canada, knows the country and the habits and modes of thought of the people, and has gained confidence and goodwill wherever he has been. The Ven. Arthur Sweatman is a native of London, M.A. of Christ's College, Cambridge, 1862, was engaged in tuition in Islington till 1865, when he came out and took charge of the Hellmuth Boys' School, in London, Ontario, where he was eminently successful. He is now co-rector of Woodstock and Archdeacon of Brant, in the Diocese of Huron. He is also Secretary of the House of Bishops, and was Bishop Hellmuth's commissary during his late prolonged absence in England." B. C. L.

THE SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

THE victory gained by suffering, and Christ as the great example both of the suffering and the victory, are forcibly brought to our notice in the Collect, Epistle and Gospel for this day's Eucharistic office. The Good Shepherd would not win His flock by following the Tempter's suggestion, "All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me;" for that would have been no victory at all. But He won His flock by giving up His life for them, and the seeming extinction of all hope on Good Friday was the step to that triumph by which the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of our God and of His Christ," the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. The humble obedience of the Son of Man "even unto death," has made Him an example to all ages, the Leader of an innumerable army of saints, the foundation of the pastoral and priestly office, by the ministrations of which, men are gathered into the one Fold of the saved ones.

And it is in this aspect of the case that the latter portion of the Gospel is seen to be so appropriate to the subject now before us; "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." The words of the Saviour would appear to indicate most emphatically that the *oneness* upon which His whole soul was set should become more and more manifest as His kingdom would become established in the earth. The Lord's words most unmistakably show that the process of Christianizing humanity was to be one not of disintegration, but one of gathering up and binding together. And the first step in this process was that our Divine Master founded and established a Church. Had He only inculcated the general principles of His faith, and left each body of believers to regulate their own ecclesiastical system, the obligation resting on every Christian man would be of the most uncertain character. And then, every self-constituted society, every assembly calling itself christian might be considered as a regular and duly authorized Church of Christ. Then, every individual who imagined himself called to preach the Gospel, or who might be asked to do so by any number of those who had chosen to unite together as a congregation, would be fully entitled to ministerial authority, and a

much qualified to administer the Sacraments as if he had received a direct commission from Heaven. Either the ministry of the Church must have been handed down from the Lord and His Apostles through the long line of those who succeeded them, or else there is no law at all upon the subject, and every one has an equal right to stand at the Altar and minister in holy things. There can be no middle ground in the matter.

But the Lord did not thus abandon the precious truth He came to communicate, so that through all following ages it might be swept about upon the surging, changing sea of popular will. He formed the casket, and left it to contain and guard the precious treasure until His coming again. He constituted His Church to be the Pillar and ground of the truth. The Christian faith was the perfection of the Jewish faith, and it could hardly be considered credible that it should be stripped of all government, and have no form of polity whatever. The Lord knew too well what was in man thus to abandon him to his own idle caprices.

It was after our Master had burst the bands of death, and triumphed over the grave; while He was still lingering on the earth to cheer His disciples, and fit them for the trials and labors that were at hand, that He gave them the high commission to go forth and lay the foundation of that spiritual kingdom, which should embrace within its fold all nations and kindred and tongues. Every part of the preparation He made for the future progress of His Church spoke of the *One Fold under one Shepherd*. Some of the most emphatic words were these:—"Peace be unto you: as My Father hath sent me, so send I you. And when He had breathed on them, He said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained." And further, "Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto Me in Heaven, and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." After such words as these, there could be no doubt or hesitation in the minds of those who had received so lofty a charge. They proceeded at once to develop their plan. They filled up the vacancy among their number—they ordained elders or priests—they instituted the order of young men or Deacons—they exercised the power they had received of binding and loosing—they acted in the spirit of the language of one of them:—"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism."

And now, it is reasonable to ask: If it is a matter of no importance to what body of so-called Christians a man belongs, why was a Church established at all? And if a Church has been established, and that Church is the body of Christ, how can we be members of Christ unless we are members of her fold? The thing can scarcely be conceived possible.

THE SCOTTISH CHURCH AND M. LOYSON.

THE course adopted by the Primate of the Scottish Church in regard to M. Loyson's (Pere Hyacinth's) movement in Paris is viewed, not only in England but in Scotland also, with a large amount of disfavor. The prospect of an Episcopal superintendence to be taken of M.

Loyson's Old Catholic Mission by the Primate and the Bishop of Edinburgh, is, we are told, regarded with increasing distrust and dislike. It might have been expected that the Scottish Bishops had quite enough to do at home among a population so extensively estranged from the Church; and that all their time and attention, as well as all the energy they could possibly employ, would be demanded in their own country without crossing the seas to meddle with an uncertain movement, for which no excuse whatever could be given. Had they been Scottish residents in Paris, for the spiritual superintendence of whom M. Loyson had been engaged, the case would have assimilated itself to that of English Chaplains on the Continent of Europe. But no excuse of that kind can be urged.

The *Scottish Guardian* of the 4th instant, contains a vigorous protest against the proposed superintendence. The two grounds of objection urged by our contemporary are, first, that the Scottish Church has never been consulted on the subject; and, secondly, that there appears to be too great a readiness on the part of their Episcopate to act under the direction of the English Church. On the latter point the writer remarks: Many are scandalized to find how ready two of our Bishops seem to be to act as mere delegates of the Archbishop of Canterbury, or of the Lambeth Conference; for it does not seem altogether clear, whether in committing themselves as far as they have to M. Loyson, they have been acting on a quasi-commission from the Conference, or at the personal desire of the Archbishop. It may, or may not, be wise and right that our Bishops should place themselves at the disposal of an informal congregation of Anglican prelates, or of the Primate of all England, to carry out ecclesiastical operations in foreign parts; but it is without controversy an entirely new course of action on their part to do so, and Scottish Churchmen think they ought to have been consulted before the semblance of such a thing was done. They have the greatest respect for the Lambeth Conference, and for the present Archbishop of Canterbury, but they hardly like the novel sight of either Conference or Archbishop making use of our Episcopate to carry out a wholly unprecedented experiment on the part of Anglican Bishops.

And further: Not only is it new to find our Bishops acting openly under guidance from Lambeth, but what they have been asked to assist is an entirely new experiment. Hitherto, rightly or wrongly, the Anglican Church has never formally interfered with Continental Churchmanship. She has provided with more or less efficiency for her own, but has left other people alone. For prelates of the Anglican Communion to undertake Episcopal supervision of M. Loyson's Mission, would be for that Communion to inaugurate an entirely new policy, and to quit in the most marked manner its old traditions. The former policy may have been mistaken, but surely its reversal is so serious a matter that our Bishops should have hesitated even to appear to bind themselves to it, without most careful and anxious consultation with the branch of the Anglican Communion which they at once govern and represent. Were we Roman Catholics, we might be annoyed, but hardly surprised, to find our Bishops reversing the traditional policy of our Church for us, without a word of counsel with anybody. But as Scottish Churchmen, whose boast is that they are free from autocratic ecclesiastical rule in Church as well as in State, we can hardly understand how such a thing could have been even thought of.