

tainly never expected to meet with a miniature imitation of something like the same thing in the election of a Dean to a seat in a Provincial Synod. The whole thing presents an aspect intensely ridiculous. We give the account as we find it in a local paper, and we are led to exclaim: "Tell it not in Gath," but by all means publish the fact in every diocese in England, where High Churchmen and Ritualists are running wild in their frantic efforts to obtain Diocesan Synods established there on pretty much the same principles as we have them in Canada.

Another thing that appears remarkable is that a considerable number of the laity united in protesting against the action of the Clergy in making a certain election not in accordance with their wishes. In our Toronto Synod a change in the election of the Lay Secretary, made entirely by the Laity themselves, was deplored by one or two of the Clergy, but we believe we are safe in stating that none of them presumed to assemble together in solemn conclave and to pass a string of resolutions protesting against the change.

We notice, too, a new idea embodied in the first resolution, to the effect that "the election to the Provincial Synod is an honor conferred upon the Clergy, in recognition of their ability and zeal in the work of the Church." It might have been supposed, had we not been otherwise informed, that the election would have reference to a far-seeing legislative ability, which can grasp the great questions affecting the well-being and integrity of a large Ecclesiastical Province.

The logical connection between the non-election of the Dean and a disruption of the Mission Fund of the Diocese is not very clear to those who were not fortunate enough to be present at this wonderful meeting, to listen to the arguments, no doubt most elaborate, which would be advanced in support of the thesis adduced. A translation of the resolution into the language we are usually accustomed to hear would, however, appear to be exactly this: "We will do all the mischief we are able, if we cannot have our own way and get our candidate elected." We referred above to the proceedings of this interesting little faction as being perfectly unique; but at the moment we forgot that, in the Toronto Synod, some two or three years ago, the Vice Chancellor positively refused to act on a certain committee unless a personal friend of his, who had been left out in the cold, should be reinstated in his former position on that committee!

This meeting at Montreal seems to revive the desire to have minorities represented. Of course that can easily be done, if the present rule be dispensed with, and minorities be allowed to carry the day. But what will the majorities say about that? And then, it surely could not have been forgotten by these wiseacres that the constitution, the very existence of a popular assembly requires that the majority thereof should decide the questions which come before it.

We must repeat that if such are to be the results of Synodical action, that action has

proved the most wretched failure we have hitherto met with; and it may yet become a question whether we ought not to endeavor to return to more scriptural and less worldly principles, in our efforts to promote the extension of the Kingdom of Messiah.

ST. JOHNS, N. B., SPECIAL RELIEF COMMITTEE.

A special relief committee has been organized for members of the Church who have suffered from the late fire in St. John's, New Brunswick; and as will be seen from the advertisement, articles of clothing and bedding will be most thankfully received and distributed during the summer months by a committee of ladies on the written application of the Parochial clergy. Those who reside in the Maritime Provinces, or sufficiently near they will no doubt be glad to forward articles of clothing and bedding, while those who reside at greater distances will doubtless prefer to send money.

It may be well to bear in mind the recommendation we gave in a former issue of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN, that contributions in money may to a very great extent be properly directed to be devoted to the re-construction of the churches which have been burnt. The loss sustained in this way is immense, and greater difficulty will be experienced in raising money to repair that loss than for the ordinary purposes of charity, to supply the immediate necessities of those who have lost everything they possessed.

THE HELLMUTH LADIES' COLLEGE.

We call the attention of our readers to the announcement in our advertising columns of this Institution, which has been commenced under influences so favorable and which promises to be remarkably successful in the western Diocese, with the Lord Bishop as President of the Institution, and with an accomplished staff of professors and teachers.

Contributions.

THE APOSTOLIC CHURCH—WHICH IS IT?

LETTER XIX.

TO REV. T. WITHROW, Professor of Church History, Londonderry—

DEAR SIR: I have not referred to the writings of the early Christians as claiming to accept all they might express, but simply as witnesses of facts and circumstances which took place in their own times, and of which they were perfectly competent to judge. Were you writing on the subject of the Divinity of our Lord, you would have no hesitation to quote from the celebrated letter of Pliny, a heathen, to the fact that the early Christians "sang hymns to Christ as God;" nor yet that passage of Josephus, a Jew, to the fact that the man Jesus, "if, indeed, it be lawful to call Him a man," "was the Christ." Surely, then, Christian writers ought to be as credible witnesses concerning the order and organization of the Christian Church, especially as they bear testimony to facts with which they were personally acquainted.

My object in this letter is to arrange the principles which we have found to exist in the constitution of the Apostolic Church, and then to apply them to the three modes of ecclesiastical

polity which we have agreed to call "Independency," "Presbytery," and "Prelacy."

The first main principle of the Apostolic Church was, that our Lord Jesus Christ was its Head, that he was "Head over all things to the Church, which is His body" (Eph. i 23, v 23, and Col. i 18) (*Vide* Letter xii.)

The second principle was that under Christ there was a permanent Ministry composed of three Orders: the first order known and referred to in the New Testament as APOSTLES, *messengers* or *angels*, but in all after ages known as BISHOPS; the second order as PRESBYTERS (elders) *bishops*, and *prophets*, but now known as PRIESTS, or *presbyters*; the third order called DEACONS, and also *pastors* and *teachers*, now distinguished by the name DEACONS. (*Vide* Letters iv, v, vi and viii.)

The third principle was that to the highest order alone belonged the right and prerogative of laying on of hands whether in Ordination or in Confirmation, and also the chief or supreme authority to exercise the power of the keys; in other words, in this order all ecclesiastical powers and prerogatives were vested and flowed through them. (*Vide* letter xvi.)

The fourth principle was that the second Order, under the control of the highest order, possessed the power of the Key and authority to preach and administer the Sacraments of our Lord's institution, (*vide* Letter xvi.)

The fifth,—That the third or lowest Order of the Ministry, by virtue of their ordination, had the authority to preach, baptize and otherwise assist the other orders, (*vide* Letter xvi.)

The sixth,—That the Christian Ministry, being "Ambassadors for God," "Ministers of Christ," and "Stewards of the Mysteries of God," must have derived, and did derive, their authority as such from God, and not from the people to whom they were Ambassadors, (*vide* Letter vii. & x.)

In applying these principles I shall invert their order and begin with the sixth principle; and proceeding backward to the first, apply them to each form of ecclesiastical polity, and then leave the settlement of the question to your own axiom, "The modern Church which embodies in its government most apostolic principles, comes nearest in its government to the Apostolic Church." (Page 19).

We will commence with your own body, the Presbyterians.

PRESBYTERY.

This system maintains, as we have seen, that there is but one order in the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, called Presbyters, to whom, in their corporate capacity belong all the prerogatives of the Christian Ministry, with full powers to ordain and to exercise the power of the keys.

In applying the sixth principle to this system I am bound to say that in all their standards of doctrine and discipline, *except 1st book Discipline*, it is distinctly and clearly maintained that the ministry of Christ must derive their authority from Him whose representatives they are, not from the people to whom they are ambassadors. You, however, make "appointment by the people" an essential to the ministerial commission. The power placed in the hands of each congregation of choosing its own ministry, is very far from making the ministerial character depend upon the popular vote.

The fifth principle is that the third or lowest Order (Deacons) as such, possessed the authority to preach and baptize and otherwise assist the other orders ministerially. This Presbyterians deny both in precept and practice, and thus contradict and condemn the constitution of the Church both in the apostolic and in every succeeding age.

Presbyterians maintain that preaching presbyters possess all the prerogatives of the Christian ministry, with full powers to ordain, administer the Sacraments, and exercise the power of the keys. In this they contradict the fourth principle which entered into the constitution of the Apostolic Church; for there the second Order (presbyters—bishops) *never ordained*, and only preached, administered the Sacraments, and exercised discipline under the control and subject to the final decision of the first or Apostolic Order.

As Presbyterians recognize no higher order in the Christian ministry than that of Presbyter, they thus deny and contradict the third principle,