

where earnestly reflect upon this plan, and resolve to do all they can to carry it out. Let this work which is so pre-eminently a patriotic work, a Church work, and a truly Christian work, go forward in all parts of the land."

HERBERT SYMONDS.

Ashburnham, Sept. 3, 1894.

"ADMITTED TO HOLY COMMUNION."

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN.

SIR,—Another letter has appeared in the *N. Y. Churchman*, on the above subject from the pen of the correspondent who asked the Bishop of Albany, N. Y. to prove his position and to say how persons are admitted in his diocese, and whether all rubrics and canons are to be interpreted in like manner as applying only to the children of the Church. This letter can be read in the issue of the *Churchman* of Aug. 25. I would like to offer a brief outline of it for your readers, not only for their information generally, but to prevent any of them sheltering themselves under, or taking the advantage of the Bishop's seeming false assumption.

The correspondent says: "I am able to state that the Bishop's idea of the technical meaning of *admit* is, practically, 'to have confirmed,' the confirmation being supplemented by registration. This interpretation appears not only to lack authority, but so far from being the technical, rubrical use of the word, to be entirely opposed to that use. In the second rubric in the order for the administration of the Lord's supper (the only rubric in the office, I think, where the word occurs), we find: The same order shall the minister use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign; *not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's table*; . . . the minister ought in that case to *admit the penitent person to the Holy Communion*. . . . Manifestly, *admit* here cannot mean, to have confirmed and registered, but is synonymous with, and used interchangeably with 'suffering to be partaker of the Lord's Table.'"

"This appears to establish the technical meaning of the word, and this line of interpretation is strengthened, if need be, by the use of the word in the rubrics of the ordinal. The second rubric in the preface (ordinal) reads: And none shall be admitted a deacon, priest, or bishop, except he be of the age which the canons in that case provided, may require. 'This is almost exactly parallel with the rubric after the Confirmation Office; and so far as the technical use of *admit* goes, a person is no more admitted to Holy Communion by Confirmation than one is admitted to Holy Orders by the attainment of a certain age. In the one case, confirmation, in the other, the attainment of a certain age, is a condition precedent to actual admitting; and in neither case does official registration after its fulfilment appear to *admit*. In each case, the actual administration of the sacrament [Holy Communion or Holy Orders] seems to be the *admitting*."

"The fancy that 'the rubric in question expresses the law and mind of the Church toward her own children, and has no reference to the case of the members of other Christian bodies,' is such as hardly to call for notice; but surprising as it may seem, I am able to say that the good bishop who wrote these amiable words is entirely willing to stretch his statement about the application of rubrics, to include *all* rubrics and canons, as intended to apply to our own clergy and people—a principle which is somewhat sweeping, and an immense advance in the ethics of subscription in the pursuit of 'Church Unity' at any cost. It is no *reductio ad absurdum* to say that it goes far toward allowing Methodist 'bishops' to execute the functions of the Episcopate in the diocese of the good bishop

during his vacation. The position is consistent with that announced in the Pastoral with regard to Holy Communion, and appears to need no further comment."

I find what is quoted above as "the second rubric in the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper" in the American Prayer Book is the *third* rubric in our Prayer Book. Again, the second rubric in the preface to the ordinal, is somewhat different from ours, still practically the same, at least for the purpose of the argument.

Yours truly,

JOHN LOCKWARD.

Port Medway N. S., Sept. 5th 1894.

THE RECTORY, KIRKTON, Ont., }  
August 31st, 1894. }

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—On reading in your last issue of a movement in the Diocese of Fredericton, N. B., in which a "Medley Memorial" has been proposed in honor of their late Bishop, the Metropolitan, it called to mind an idea which years ago suggested itself to me, viz: the need of a travelling Missioner for the Diocese of Huron. Such is the form which the proposed memorial has taken in New Brunswick, and \$15,000 is the sum aimed at as a permanent endowment for its support. Now, what could be more needful for the extension of this diocese, and for the development and prosperity of our Church, than such a provision as that of a travelling or "Home Missioner" to supply vacant charges, conduct missions, fill temporary vacancies, overtake weak missions in sparsely peopled districts, and by occasional visits to settled charges encourage and strengthen the hands of many a rural clergyman who is laboring year in and year out with little help or sympathy from brother clergymen? With such a wide area to overtake in a diocese like that of Huron, it is next to impossible for a Bishop to visit all the country missions oftener than once in three or four years; and one can imagine the impetus and encouragement which an ordained travelling missioner, authorised by the Bishop, would give to many a struggling cause. We send monies to convert the heathen—and so we ought, if we desire to fulfil the Saviour's commission: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature"—but what are we doing at home to gather in the scattered sheep who are without a shepherd over them? What are we doing to conserve, to develop, and to extend the interests of our beloved Church? What is wanted is a travelling missionary like St. Paul, who, though not a Bishop, would have "the care of all the churches." And if some of our earnest and wealthy laymen would only tackle to the work, and succeed in engineering a movement in the Synod and out of it for cheering and encouraging the hearts of our people—more especially in rural settlements, where our people are few and far between, and where the visit of an ordained missionary is seldom known—we predict such a measure of success on Church lines as would make "the wilderness to rejoice and blossom as the rose."

Yours faithfully,

H. DOUGLAS STEELE.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN.

SIR,—I have read with great interest, the letter in your late issue headed, "Admitted to Holy Communion," and as the writer of it suggests that some of his readers should furnish you with some of their "pleased or surprised thoughts," I venture to put forward some of mine.

I certainly am pleased to find that Bishop Doane recognises the validity of Roman Catholic Confirmation. If the Roman Church does not admit the validity of *our* acts of baptism, confirmation, and ordination, let us at any rate, be

above such narrow minded unreasonable bigotry, well assured as we are, both by faith and reason and the evident fruits of this faith and reason, that the hand of the Lord is upon us and with us.

As to the other point concerning the admission of unconfirmed persons to the Holy Communion, the Bishop's view does not seem strange to me, for it has been my view, and the view of most other priests, I think, for very many years. Bishop Doane evidently thinks that to admit an unconfirmed person, under exceptional circumstances to the Holy Communion, is not equivalent to admitting such a one as a *regular* communicant. We cannot, for a moment suppose that the Bishop would sanction the admission to the Holy Communion, on any terms, of an *unbaptised* person; but if we recognise the validity of baptism by non-episcopally ordained ministers, it seems unreasonably harsh in the case of a good Christian who has been born and brought up in a schismatic community, and who now wishes to draw nearer to the ancient Church, to drive him away from the Lord's table simply because he does not yet see the need of Episcopal Confirmation. The rubric on this point was, as the Bishop says, intended to apply to members of the Anglican Church, not to outsiders, and it seems to me that the Bishop of any Diocese is perfectly justified in relaxing it in the case before us.

The rubric forbidding the use of our "Burial Service" in the case of unbaptised persons and suicides, is not analogous to the confirmation rubric, because unbaptised persons are not members of Christ's Church and suicides cannot be considered as dying "in the Lord," but good Christians who are members of schismatic communities, are not necessarily all under the guilt of heresy and schism; their position is generally more their misfortune than their fault.

If baptism is the true bond of brotherhood among all the Baptised, we ought surely to give every encouragement to those who are schismatics only through the accident of parentage and education.

AN OLD MISSIONARY.

CHURCH NEWSPAPERS.

Again the Bishop asks "how many of us take a Church paper?" A weekly Church paper? If not, why not? Are we too poor? Better save on the dailies, and weeklies, and monthlies that lie so thick on our tables. If we cannot afford it, cannot we club with our neighbors and pass the papers round? Do we not think it worth while? Such a paper not worth reading and paying for? Try it awhile and see. You will find it gives as much for the money as any paper you buy. You will find that the news of Christian work, missionary information, the suggestive discussion of great and important topics that are to be gotten from a good Church paper are worth more than neighborhood gossip and local "personals," even more than the account of the murders and robberies and bank failures of the civilized world, yes, and worth more than even the wholesome and needful information that comes to us through the enterprise of the daily paper. We do not undervalue the merits of the general newspaper. Men and women who do not use it are likely to be dangerously ignorant of many things they should know, although those who read it through and through are too apt to know a good many things they should be better off not to know. But all one can say about the use of secular papers only makes stronger the fact of the great need of religious information and intelligent interest in the progress of religion. So again we urge you, all who read this paper, to take a larger one also and take time to read it. It will help you.—*Bishop Brooke.*