

and consequently the existence of that highest Order through which flows all ministerial authority, and who have their continuity most fully assured in the express words of Holy Scripture.

The second principle which entered into the Constitution of the Apostolic Church was the existence of *three permanent Orders* in the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, distinguished in the New Testament by the names Apostles or Angels, Elders or Bishops, and Deacons, but now known as Bishops, Priests or Presbyters and Deacons. This principle the Presbyterians condemn both in their teaching and observance, as they maintain but one Order in the Ministry of the Word and Ordinances. Some Presbyterians, it is true, finding that there were three Orders in the Ministry of the Apostolic Church and in all after ages, as is shown in Church history, have sought to bring their system into harmony with that Church by calling their preacher a *Bishop*, their ruling elders *Presbyters*, and of course their *Deacons* would make a third class. But I have no doubt you will agree with me in pronouncing it to be simply a *devout imagination*, as the two latter classes are confessed to be no ministers of the Word at all.

And when we come to the application of the chief principle of all, viz., the Headship of Christ alone over His Church and Kingdom—what can I say? I will only ask, is it an evidence that Presbyterians maintain and recognize our Lord Jesus Christ as the sole Head of the Church when they refuse and condemn as repugnant to the Word of God the Ministry which he appointed, which He commissioned with *His own authority* and promised to be with “*always, even to the end of the world*”? Would such a course be recognized as *fealty* by an earthly king? Fealty to our Divine King, like that due to an earthly sovereign, is proven by *acts* rather than by *words*—by humble obedience to His laws and institutions rather than by blatant *professions* of loyalty to His person. English history speaks of men who, while making professions of deep loyalty to the person of their monarch, delivered him up to his murderers for a consideration. The proper way, therefore, to recognize the authority of our Lord and King as head over all things to the Church, is by accepting the authority of the officers which he has commissioned for the “*work of the Ministry and for the edifying of the Body of Christ*,” and also in the *order* in which He has “*set*” or constituted them, viz.:—*First, APOSTLES; secondarily, PROPHETS; thirdly, Teachers.* (I Cor. xii 28.)

INDEPENDENCY.

This system maintains, as we have seen, that there is but one order in the ministry, and holds that the prerogative of ordination is vested in each single congregation, or those whom that congregation may depute to act for them. As Dr. Davidson expresses it, “*a minister is either the minister of one church, viz.: that by which he has been chosen, or else he is not a minister at all. When he ceases to be pastor of a church he ceases to be a minister of the Gospel till he be elected by another.*” * * He is not made a minister by the act of ordination but by the *people's call and his acceptance of it*, by virtue of which a solemn engagement is entered into; and when the engagement terminates he ceases to be a minister. (Eccles. Polity of New Test., p. 200.) This is very much like saying that the English Ambassador to the Government of the United States receives his credentials and derives his authority as such *from the American people*; and as a system it denies and contradicts every single one of the above principles which entered into the constitution of the Apostolic Church.

We will now turn to that form of ecclesiastical polity which we have agreed to call—

PRELACY.

This system declares in its authorized formula that: “*It is evident to all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' times there have been these orders of ministers in Christ's Church—BISHOPS, PRIESTS, and DEACONS,*” and teaches that to the highest order alone belongs the chief authority in the Church with the prerogative of laying on of hands whether in ordination or confirmation.

The sixth principle we found to exist in the government of the Apostolic Church was that

the ministry of the Church, being ambassadors for God and stewards of His mysteries, derived their commission and authority from Him, not from the people. And how does the Church of England act in reference to this principle. I reply, by permitting none to minister at her altar except he has been “*called, tried, examined and admitted thereunto*” in accordance with Scriptural and Apostolic usage and custom. The man may be earnest in what he undertakes; he may, like St. Paul when he was persecuting the Church of God, think that he is doing God service; he may even do much good morally and intellectually by his work and lectures; thousands may have united in appointing him to his position, and and millions may recognize that appointment as valid, yet it is all as “*a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal*” to the Church of England, for unless he has had Apostolic or, as it is called, *Episcopal ordination*,—that is, except he has been called, tried, examined, and admitted to his office by that Order which Holy Scripture and all antiquity unite in declaring to *alone* possess that power and by which alone it can be transmitted—he is looked upon as a mere *layman* and as having no more authority to minister in holy things, to act as a minister of God, than had Korah and his company to take upon themselves the priestly office and presume to burn incense before the Lord. (Vide Numb. xvi.) The Anglican Church, therefore, in all her branches and in the strictest manner maintains the sixth principle.

That the fifth principle is also maintained by the Church of England is proven by the words used at the ordination of Deacons: “*It appertaineth to the office of a Deacon, in the church where he shall be appointed to serve, to assist the Priest in Divine Service,*” etc., etc. (See the Order in the Prayer-book). In the ancient “*Use*” of Salisbury the office of a deacon is thus described: “*Deaconum oportet ministrare ad altare, Evangelium legere, Baptizare et Prædicare.*”

As to the fourth principle, viz., that the second Order possessed the authority to preach, administer the Sacraments, and exercise discipline subject to the authority of the first or highest Order, I may say that it is fully taught and acted upon by the Anglican Church, as may be evident to all by examining “*the form and manner of Ordering of Priests,*” both in the Church of England and in the Church in the United States of America.

That the third and second principles are maintained in all their integrity is proven from the invariable practice of the Church of England, the United States, and Canada, and by the express declaration of the “*Preface to the form and manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.*”

That the Church of England recognizes and maintains beyond all controversy that our Lord Jesus Christ is head over all things to the Church—that He is King of Kings and Lord of Lords—I have already proven (*vide* Letter xii), and that she teaches and acts in accordance with this principle is evident in every service she engages in, by every solemn act which she performs and by every ordinance she administers, doing all *in His name by His authority and through the ministry which He appointed.*

Nor does the act of parliament (26 Henry viii Chap 1) which declares the King to be the head of the Church of England contradict this in the least degree. That act simply recognized in the King of England in opposition to all foreign potentates, especially the Popes of Rome, a visitatorial power or authority viz., that it rested with him and not with them to visit, repress, redress, reform, order, correct, restrain, and amend errors, heresies &c., while by the act of the church even this authority was declared to belong to the King “*only so far as the law of Christ would allow*”. Nor did King Henry viii. himself, consider that the title “*head of the Church of England*” confirmed upon him any purely spiritual powers whatsoever, as may be seen from his letter to the clergy of the Province of York (A.D. 1533) on this very subject and which I append to those letters for the benefit of “*slandrous folk*” whose minds are offended by this title as applied to him and in which he very severely censures and chastens those who strain the words to make them imply what those who first used them never intended.

We find, then, on minute and patient examina-

tion, that the six main principles of government that were by inspired men established in the Apostolic Church are all recognized and practically carried out, not by *Independency*, nor yet by *Presbyterianism*, but by *PRELACY* alone—by that very Church of whose order of government you so boldly “*infer that while that Church may be entitled to great respect as a human system maintained by Act of Parliament, and numbering in its ranks many estimable people, at the peril of excommunication, we feel bound to declare our conviction that the government of the Church of England is repugnant to the Word of God*” (pp. 47 and 48).

As you are a Professor of Church History, of course you would not have made the above sweeping assertion without being prepared to show *what* “*human*” being organized the “*system*,” and *when and where* he did so. Permit me, then, to ask you, for the benefit of those who are not professors of Church History, *at what time, in what place, and by what person* was this “*human system*” organized?

We know no other system or body claiming to be a Church of Christ than that you thus vilify, of whose form of ecclesiastical government the same statement can be made without departure from the truth.

I remain, etc.

T. G. P.

Diocesan Intelligence.

FREDERICTON.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

Our annual Diocesan meetings are held alternately in the maritime city of St. John, and the inland See Town of Fredericton. This year they were held in the latter place, and extended over a period of five days, beginning on Monday the 2nd inst. The Bishop's regular Triennial Visitation, also took place this year. All the meetings were in every way pleasant and profitable; and we have good reason to congratulate ourselves on their character and results. Perhaps their most striking feature was the real harmony which prevailed throughout them, and which nothing occurred to disturb in the least, a feature due largely to the wise, patient, and impartial administration of our sincerely beloved Diocesan. Men came to work, both clergymen and laymen; and work they did, most faithfully; yet they went away at the end of their labors, refreshed in body and spirit. For there was nothing to grieve or embitter; nature appeared in her loveliest dress; Fredericton was generously and solicitously hospitable; and the cathedral was open to all as the house of prayer. The following were the services held especially for the members of the Synod and Church Society:

Wednesday at 7.30 a.m., Holy Communion; Wednesday at 5 p.m., prayers; Thursday at 7.30 a.m., prayers; Thursday at 8 p.m., Choral service and sermon; Friday at 9 a.m., Litany. There were prayers also, on Wednesday evening in the Parish Church. It is gratifying to be able to add that the attendance of the laity etc., on these services was large.

An account of the Synod meeting will appear in the next issue of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN. The following is a brief sketch of the other meetings, in the order of their occurrence.

Board of Foreign Missions.—The first meeting of the series was the public anniversary of the Board of Foreign Missions. This Board was formed in connection with the Synod in 1874. During the three years of its existence it has been instrumental in awakening an increased interest throughout the Diocese in Foreign missions; and there has been a corresponding increase in offerings.

Report of the Fredericton Board of Foreign Missions.

To the Diocesan Synod of Fredericton.—The Board of Foreign Missions beg to submit the following report:

During the past year, the Board have remitted or paid over to the various Missionary purposes directed by the donors, the sum of \$1718.51 as appears by the Treasurer's account submitted herewith, which has been distributed as follows:—