

Vacancies.—In Huron also there is a demand for additional labourers. The three churches in Wardsville are vacant by the transference of Rev. W. J. Taylor, and there is the vacancy of St. George's, Thorndale.

FOREIGN.

THE CHURCH: ONE HOLY, CATHOLIC, APOSTOLIC. By EARL NELSON.—The *Nonconformist and Independent* of February 16th, 1888, in an article on "The Office for Unity," put forth by the Home Reunion Society, writes: "If that Society would promote true union between the Churches, it must abandon the dream of submission to Anglicanism and further movement, such as that for interchange of pulpits, &c."

By holding to the Creeds of Christendom we believe in One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and the first thing necessary before any negotiations towards reunion must be an explanation of what the Dissenters really mean by their claim, pretty generally asserted now, to be Independent Churches.

How can such a position be justified by a reference to Holy Scripture or to the history of the Church Catholic, or to the history of their own secession from our branch of it? We need not complicate matters by going outside our own islands. From the first introduction of Christianity among the British, Irish, or Scotch, we have every reason to believe there were the *Oredenda*, and two great Sacraments, and the sacred Ministry; and all Christians since the time of Archbishop Theodore, A.D. 678, were united in one visible Church until the Brownists went out from it, and from this secession the Congregationalists or Independents spring. After this the Pope refused to allow his followers to communicate with us, because we denied the Papal Supremacy. The Baptists and Quakers split off more from the original secession and from one another than from the Church itself. The Presbyterians broke with Episcopacy, but held to the succession of the Priesthood; though even this was irregular by the omission, in their first book of Discipline, of "the imposition of hands." The Wesleyans like the Brownists, have gradually drawn away from the Church itself, and they are so far alike in both having been led by a priest of the Church, who, in the one case, never left it, and in the other, returned to his allegiance to her. Now, how in the face of these facts can any of the dissenting bodies show that they are independent churches? or, after all, what do they really mean by the term?

It is a very new claim; it is not so long ago that you could not insult a Wesleyan more than by refusing to look upon him as a member of the Church of England, and it is within the memory of living men that Independents and Baptists first began to call themselves independent churches. It is a proof of the importance of maintaining the true notes of the Church that, as these bodies assert their claim to be independent churches, they immediately think more of the necessity of *credenda*, a ritual, and a ministry specially set apart from their lay people.

But these things cannot of themselves make a Church. There are no *Oredenda* but the Creeds of the Church Catholic. Orders cannot proceed from unordained men, and Sacraments are but empty signs unless duly administered.

I do not write these things from any desire to insult Dissenters. God forbid! Neither in asking them to unite with us in one visible Church is any insult intended. The Church was theirs as well as ours before they left it, and would be theirs again on their return. No man made the Church of England as Brown, or Fox, or Wesley originated the bodies connected with their names. We are simply the descendants of those who remained in her. She is in essentials the same from which the original seceders went out, though now greatly strengthened by the number and vigour of her various organizations.

These various secessions damaged the Church as well as the seceders, and the secessions themselves may be fairly looked upon as punishments justly deserved and sent to point out the shortcomings of her fallible rulers who in those days drifting from her old traditions, sought to enforce a rigid uniformity by fines and imprisonments, or, at a later period, were slothful in providing for the spiritual needs of our rapidly increasing population.

There is no doubt that the very fact of divisions, which drove Rome to shackle all freedom of thought by the Tridentine Decrees, also compelled our branch or the Church, and even the sects themselves, to bind the freedom of thought and action more than it ever had been bound in pre-Reformation times.

Where, then, is the insult in asking all to reunite with us under the old Catholic standards? Rejoicing in the freedom from persecuting laws which the Nonconformists have already won, both for us and for themselves; acknowledging their works for Christ during the time of separation; offering them, on our part, the old *Oredenda*, the Apostolic Orders, the true sacraments, which, with the Holy Scriptures,

the old Church has preserved, and which they seem to be feeling after in their new desire to become full and independent churches.

Then, as to the claim for toleration, they cannot consistently "deprecate any attempt to narrow the basis of Christian fellowship," or "ask for toleration of opinions which do not affect loyalty to the Divine Master," and, at the same time, enact new restrictions by denouncing what they call Sacerdotalism and the Sacramental system! I believe that under the creeds, the Sacraments, and Apostolic Orders, there has been of old time, and therefore that there may be again, a toleration of individual opinion as to non-essentials in the Church Catholic, which far exceeds the freedom of the so-called free churches, so long as men do not seek to press their individual opinions upon others as matters of faith; and I have ever held that reforms in things non-essential would be more speedily and effectually carried out by the Church herself, through the co-operation of all her members, than by bodies claiming to be outside or in opposition to her.

We do not ask a return to the evils and mistakes to which their separate secessions severally witnessed, but to the Church freed from a persecuting spirit, and full of that voluntary effort and that missionary zeal so which their example called us. We do not ask a return to a church bound by strict uniformity laws, or where the spiritual authority is hopelessly overruled by the temporal power, but to the Church which, strengthened by the very unity for which we pray, would show forth all her spiritual strength and all her spiritual freedom; to the church which would allow the reunited people, while acting under the recognised authorities of the diocese and province, to maintain their corporate character, with everything relating to their internal government or requirements, as great orders or brotherhoods within the Church, left wholly to their own control.

I venture to think that such a consummation is worth trying for, and that prayers to this end may be asked for without conveying any insult to any who confess and call themselves Christians. It would, when achieved, go far to secure a "fraternal co-operation in all good works among all the disciples of Jesus Christ." It would enable us to present a more solid front against infidelity and sin, and it would gain for all a sure foundation on the truths of Scripture as interpreted by the Creeds, which contain the consensus of all Christendom on the essential doctrines of the Christian faith.

Correspondence.

All Letters containing personal allusions will appear over the signature of the writer.

We do not hold ourselves responsible for the opinions of our correspondents.

PENMANSHIP.

SIR,—Some profess to read character by the handwriting. The potency of the pen for good or evil is recognized everywhere; that it is "mightier than the sword" is fully admitted. It sometimes does evil when intended for good. There are a great many educated men that are very poor writers. Provocation and disaster have resulted from poor penmanship. It is said bad writing involves a question of morals. Often bad writing finds its way into the hands of a compositor, who is a poor man supporting his family by his daily wages. With ordinary "copy" he can make a fair living, but sometimes the manuscript is so poorly written that the compositor is compelled to jump down from his case, frequently, to hunt up the foreman in order to make out a word or sentence. By this he loses much valuable time and money, and perhaps was led into temptation in the way of profanity. In common with our brethren of the press, we have, among our correspondents, some friends who give us shocking specimens of hand writing. Not long ago I received a letter from an M. P., and also one from a high dignitary of the church, which I could not read, because of the writing being so bad. What a variety of styles checks assume, from the ample sheets of dubious corporations to the simple slips of paper. But one thing I have observed in checks is that the handwriting of the signature is not, generally, as good as that of the filling up. The master or proprietor who signs with rough hand, has usually made his own way in the world. The clerk who writes under his orders has frequently been, what we call educated. Every person occupying a position of responsibility and trust, should write a good hand. In the case of many poor writers it is a mere habit; once they were good writers, but as the use of the pen became more and more imperative, they would write hurriedly until a habit is formed, and their writing assumes the form of a more scrawl, so that to make out their writing imposes

a task upon their correspondents. Many misunderstandings arise from poor penmanship. Frequently, writers to the press are chagrined reading their own articles, to find words printed that they never intended. If they could look into the composing room and witness the struggle of their manuscript, they would have great charity for the proof-reader and try to write plainer the next time. Writing, whether for the pulpit or the press, ought to be plain. A little care and patience will enable anyone to write a clear, legible hand. Let the writing of an article that no one can read, be discarded. The advent of the typewriter may possibly obviate the difficulty of bad writing.

P. Tocque.

"L. S. T.'s" CONCLUSION.

SIR,—While respectfully thanking the Rev. Dr. Carry for his notice of my former letter, I seriously object to his uncharitable charge of "dangerous fooling" in this matter.

1. As to the doctor's interpretation of my expression—let us be gentle in handling the question—"determining, as he clearly means," may I say that my meaning is rather "to treat; to discourse on; to discuss"—as from the drift of my letter, toleration is my plea, as distinguished from the dogmatic "determining" suggested by my critic.

2. As to the "monstrous" and "unreasonable" question with which I am charged by the learned divine, in asking might not the fruit of the vine be new and unfermented? Permit me to quote the determination of the Divine law-giver—"But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom, (Matt. 26, 29; Mark 14, 25), may we not, therefore, be allowed to copy the pattern of this heavenly feast, the new wine of which, may be symbolised, however faintly, by the sacramental cup? And, as for an alteration of an element in the eucharist being unallowable, as matter of fact *leavened* bread is allowed, whereas *unleavened* bread is the law of the passover: surely then, according to the rubric of common sense, it follows that whereas the Church has ruled that the purest and best wheat bread may suffice, i.e., bread plus leaven—surely "good and wholesome wine," minus fermentation, might be allowed.

3. Again, Dr. Carry's assertion concerning the unbroken practice of the Church for eighteen centuries, certainly doesn't extend to some of the oriental branches of the Church, e.g., in Egypt and other countries where the wine is prepared over night, and is consequently unfermented. Again, I read that "the heads of the two great sections of the Jews in England, those who closely follow the rabbinical traditions, and those who are more liberal in thought and practice, unite in the testimony that the use of unfermented wine, prepared from fresh grapes and raisins, is lawful at the passover."

4. But do we not well to appeal to the temper of the time? e.g., did not Hezekiah resort to drastic measures in destroying that sacred "fossil"—the brazen serpent? Because the people idolised it, and burned incense to it. And is it not expedient for the Church, when wine so often causeth my brother to offend and to stumble, and to be made weak, to use new wine, which can never cause a drunkard to relapse, especially when there is excellent precedent for the same.

In conclusion—far be it from me, my respected sir "to avoid the steady effect of the Church by writing anonymously," although I am of opinion that the ruling, even of the Pan Anglican Synod against "new" wine, would not be acceptable to the Church Catholic.

Cote St. Antoine,
Montreal.

THOMAS EVERETT.

DIOCESE OF ONTARIO SUPERANNUATION FUND

SIR,—Some definite expression of the administration of the Clergy Superannuation Fund should be given before the meeting of Synod. By report of committee only 48 clergy are contributors, certainly every clergyman should do something for himself to provide against disablement; that only a minority subscribe argues that either the rest cannot afford to do so, or they have no confidence in the power of the fund to do what is desired. I think a clear expression of policy by the committee at Synod or before, would probably remove this distrust. I venture to suggest one or two: In the first place, the early clergy of the diocese are admitted on payment of \$5 yearly, those who have come later pay proportionately to their ages, and quite right too, but it is not clear that they are all placed on the same footing, once the element of proportionate payment admitted, the fund ceases in any way to be "a charity," and becomes a business transaction, in which no length of service can entitle

to priority of clergy if dis- the mission cases. Now are such pay not as an an mission fund ened means by paying to the mission there that th some years. They will be might in five encroached o that in that cited, and flocks need t case would t men were or retirement, i not the same gain that w regard to the they have n to do justice position the think many, consideration fund is to be the new fun a right to co be fails to point worth they will r reverse; the and hence p more prosp ingly; say a widows and year in all i break the p and, in the sum of mon he loses all down come trust the co to the fund, the well bei of policy, w men for wh present no more energ it were onc fund would parish, and some one probably pr at present l Deans might visited their

SIR,—I n week's Ch correspond lish mine tl Anyone car Carry befo unbroken (the nineteen that wine, languages, This, howe people, wh usage, and mild term, forces itse the tempe Ignorance minds ever cism, that question is ignorance s us? In n Conference matter at r give it to t to say tha heresy, or remain un would take prelates, s Would Dr. of this sug derence. for correcti of the wor: 18th Apr