

he thinks that I caricature Baptist people when I refer to the origin of the Baptist denominations, he is wrong again. Mr. Smith, father of the English Baptists, could not see any one authorized to baptize him, so he baptized himself, and so started a Church. But the father of American Baptists adopted another plan. Twelve men in a place in New England, about two hundred and fifty years ago, arrived at the conclusion that they had never been baptized, and in their own eyes were of course heathen men. They did not as the father of the English Baptists, each man immerse himself, they adopted another plan. They empowered and authorized one unbaptized to baptize another of their number. These unbaptized men believed they had power and authority to baptize, if not, they could not impart to Ezekiel Holliman any power or authority. A curious thing in this connection, is the fact, that in the fulness of power, they authorized Ezekiel Holliman to baptize only one man, named Roger Williams, then Roger Williams baptized Ezekiel Holliman and the other men of their company. And thus they started the Baptist Churches in America.

Let us go back and look at the origin of baptism as practiced in the Catholic Church for the space of sixteen hundred years before Ezekiel Holliman performed the first baptism. God the Son said to those Whom He had educated and trained under His own eye for more than three years, "Go ye and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Here Christ, God the Son, gives the power to baptize; whilst in the New England States eleven heathen men say to another man, who is also a heathen—not in covenant with God, not recognized in any way as the servant of God,—Go thou and baptize, baptize one. This Baptist baptism is merely a human institution in its origin, and is so at the present time. "Rothsay" says I am intolerant in thus denying the validity of the baptism administered by Baptist denominations. If I am so, how monstrous must the intolerance of Baptist denominations be when they deny the validity of a Sacrament ordained by Christ in person, and practiced in the Catholic Church for sixteen hundred years before Baptist baptism was imagined. "Rothsay" says I will repent of what I said on this head. What, repent of telling the truth! God forbid. The Jews rejected Christ, and it is prophesied they will repent. Our Baptist neighbours rejected the baptism instituted by Christ, and invented one of their own. I for one heartily hope and pray they will repent.

Rothsay, moreover, says that the religious bodies outside the Church are not treated with respect and affection. I have not seen any want of respect or affection. The neighbouring religious bodies in general believe the Church has neither Altar nor Priesthood. The ministers in those bodies do not claim to be priests in the Church of God. I cannot see that there is any lack of respect in refraining from calling the gentlemen who minister in those religious bodies by a name which they repudiate. I am not conscious that any part of charity is trampled on, if one says that some excellent and estimable men are not in the Church of Christ on earth. Our Lord Himself, concerning St. John the Baptist, says, "Of those that are born of woman there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist; yet he that is least in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than he." If the least, the youngest infant in the Kingdom of Heaven, is greater than Noah, Moses, Abraham, Samuel, Isaiah, Daniel, etc., etc., are we not to infer that these excellent servants of God did not belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, to the Church of Christ on earth? We are not to infer that for this reason they will be lost; nor will all that belong to the Church of Christ on earth—the true Church—be saved. Christ says, "They shall come from the east and from the west, etc., and sit down with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob in the Kingdom of God, and some of the children of the Kingdom shall be thrust out, some born by spiritual regeneration into the Kingdom shall be thrust out."

"Rothsay" affirms that the Archbishop of Canterbury, and some other Bishops, commend men who are not episcopally ordained on account of the work these gentlemen have done, and seems to think for this reason they should be recognized as Priests in the Christian Church. Suppose this idea was adopted, it would carry us further than I am persuaded "Rothsay" would go. Charles Bradlaugh, in a late speech, declared that a clergyman of the Church of England commended him on account of some work he did in London. Are we to call Mr. Bradlaugh an exemplary Christian because this clergyman commended him? He repudiates the Christian name. Are we to call these gentlemen who work for Christ, whom some Bishops commend, Priests in the Church of Christ? They repudiate the name of Priest. Of course I do not intend to class Mr. Bradlaugh with such gentlemen as the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks of.

"Rothsay" speaks very bitterly of Episcopal Churches; he speaks of the different Eastern Churches cursing each other. The Eastern Church is either Greek or Armenian. Can "Rothsay" name the time, the place, and the persons by whom this mutual cursing was done? Can he tell of the time and place of the Greek and English Churches cursing each other, or of the English Church cursing the Reformed Episcopal? If he cannot do this, his remarks on this head seem to partake of the character of a railing accusation, and are very inconsistent with the excessive tenderness that pervades his remarks when speaking of modern denominations, such as Mormons, Universalists, Unitarians, Adventists, etc., etc.

Concerning that new body called the Reformed Episcopal Church, it must be clear to all that Dr. Cummins was the author of a schism, and if the Word of God ruled in the hearts of men, he would have had no followers, and that body would have no existence this day. The Word of God says, "Mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine ye have learned, and avoid them. For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly, and by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple." Such is the character God gives of such men as the late Dr. Cummins; and if men had obeyed God rather than Dr. Cummins, there would have been one sin less to answer this day.

QUAERO.

#### OAK POINT CHURCH.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Who could the correspondent of the *Telegraph* be who said "Oak Point Church \* \* \* is well arranged inside, with 16 single pews in the centre, and 8 large square pews on each side?" I remember such things before I fell asleep.

Yours,  
RIP VAN WINKLE.

#### MR. DIKE'S STATISTICS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—The statistics of Mr. Dike, about which your correspondent "R. S." inquires in your last issue, were first made public in a lecture delivered by that gentleman in January last, in the "Boston Monday Lectureship" course, on the subject "Facts as to Divorce in New England." The lecture is published with nine others of the course, in a volume, entitled "Christ and Modern Thought," by Roberts Bros., Boston, price \$1.50; to the Clergy, \$1.00.

I mail to you herewith an authorized and verbatim report of the lecture, which appeared in a Boston paper the day after the delivery. I also enclose the "Report of the Committee on Divorce," made to the Convention of this Diocese last May. Perhaps you may see fit to re-produce one or both, in whole or in part, in your columns.

Yours sincerely,  
ANDREW GRAY.

Chelsea, Mass., Sept. 12th, 1881.

#### DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—The appeal of the Nova Scotia Corresponding Committee of Domestic Missions of the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada having now been published in your paper, I suppose I shall not be stepping beyond the lines of propriety, if, (although a member of the Board), as an individual, I try to promote the object of the appeal by a letter over my own name.

In the second column of the last issue of the *Church Guardian* you quote from a letter of an Oxford B. A., at Montreal. I would ask your readers to look back to it—(it is the last item in the column):—"A few pounds a year will secure a number of Clergymen to travel the length and breadth of (our N. W. Territory) this 'Greater Britain,' and establish a Prayer Book Service, 'within reach of every Englishman's home' in the '3,000,000 square miles,' and 'every such clergyman will get 100 acres of land given him as a settler.'"

Is not this a most desirable object, and shall the "few pounds be wanting?"

Hundreds of thousands of the new comers have been brought up by our Mother Church of England, and they love and delight in her Services; they would be pained to have their infants baptized—their grown children married—their beloved dead committed to the earth in any other way, and with any other words than those in time-honoured and sacred forms to which they and their ancestors have ever been accustomed. Further—even if they can maintain Prayer Book Services in their isolated homes, still if no Clergyman of their own be near, we know by our experience in Nova Scotia that the next generation will inevitably drift away to the nearest place of worship, whatever denomination it may own it. Such would have been more entirely the case in this Diocese had not the Mother Church taken care of us at first, (and indeed to some extent she does so still). It is not many years since the seven parishes now self-supporting were all receiving large aid from home, which they had had from their birth. We of Nova Scotia have then "freely received." Let us, therefore, "freely give," now that we are becoming a parent of new Dioceses. We are the oldest Colonial Diocese in the British Realm.

Large subscriptions, while we are just, alas, learning to go alone, may not be always attainable, but cents soon become dollars, and this increase by tens can be effected without injury to any. Suppose that every Clergyman institute a *great North-West Mile Society* in his Parish or Mission; one collection even in each place, where he holds Service, would get a little, and "many a mickle makes a muckle." Of course, the rich can give more. There is a special blessing on the giver, larger than on the receiver.

Your other paper, *CHURCH WORK*, gave us the

following in the number for September. I will ask you to let me finish with it, for indeed I believe that "Missionary zeal" would reduce to a minimum "dead parishes":—

"Missionary zeal is ever the characteristic of a living Church. A Church absorbed in itself, heedless of Christ's commission, and caring not for the myriads in darkness, is dead. And as there is no better index to the real condition of a Church, so there is no better means by which spiritual and congregational life can be strengthened and invigorated, than the cultivation of a missionary spirit, and of the self-sacrifice and liberality which are its outcome. A true evangelical faith never settles down into a dreary antinomianism which in its intended reverence for God's sovereignty attempts to cover up its indolence, while it dishonours and misrepresents the Divine character. Faith is no barren, inactive theory. It worketh by love. Love gives it energy and vitality, and causes it to find expression and embodiment in works of goodness by which it seeks to benefit others. Nor can these works be confined within an narrow sphere. In its ardor and vehemence it reaches out into all the world, seeking to make other partakers of its own blessedness bearing to men those Glad-Tidings in which alone life and peace can be found. So it has ever been in the history of the Church, that its times of abounding and exuberant life have ever been times of earnest missionary zeal. Then were they constrained to go and tell others all 'the words of this life.'"

Yours, &c.,  
D. C. MOORE.

#### A DISCLAIMER.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Allow me to direct the attention of the readers and subscribers of the *Evangelical Churchman* to the following statement: On the 28th July last the Editor of the *Evangelical Churchman* said, in a leading article referring to the Diocese of Fredericton and the Bishop Co-adjutor, "those who urged the Canon on, in hope evidently of securing an extreme sacerdotalist, are the only disappointed ones, and they are grievously disappointed." I immediately wrote over my own name to the editor, and challenged him to produce proof that any one person "urged the Canon on in hope of securing an extreme sacerdotalist," or that any one person "who urged the Canon on has since then expressed the slightest disappointment." This challenge was sent August 11th. From that day to this not one particle of proof has the Editor been able to offer in support of these two statements, nor has he had the honesty to admit that they are not true. Having been an advocate of the Canon, and a member of the Synod when it was passed, I do not hesitate to say plainly that both these accusations are false, and that the Editor of the *Evangelical Churchman* cannot meet the challenge I have thrown down. I am sure that my fellow-Churchmen in this Diocese who subscribe to that paper will join in condemning such an unfair and unmanly attempt to stir up strife among those who should work together as brethren. Whatever differences we have with one another in the Diocese of Fredericton, a spirit of fairness has always been shown, to which the Editor of the *Evangelical Churchman* is an utter stranger. I believe this spirit still prevails; and if the Editor of the *Evangelical Churchman* persists in misrepresenting us by statements which he cannot prove, and which he has not the manliness to withdraw, he will find himself without a single subscriber here in a very little while. He is mistaken if he supposes that Churchmen of any school of thought in the Maritime Provinces will support a paper that shews such a want of Christian principle.

GEO. A. SCHOFIELD.

St. John, N. B., Sept. 14th, 1881.

#### THE INVISIBLE CHURCH.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—Your correspondent "Rothsay" appears to be firmly intrenched in his position respecting "The Invisible Church" and Apostolic succession; but I observe that while he pursues a policy of negation through the greater part of his reply, in the end he, to a certain extent, admits the truth of my assertions. He closes his epistle thus: "Will not 'Layman' admit and lament, with the writer, that there is sad lack of visible unity amongst us?" I will admit that there is a sad lack of unity in the *Christian world*, and, with him, I lament over its existence; and the very fact that he and I have to do so shows that we both consider that *divisions* are both wrong and sinful; and I furthermore admit that it is the duty of all earnest men to labor for the restoration of that *perfect unity* for which the Son of God prayed so fervently, and which St. Paul, in his epistle, so earnestly commends to the followers of Christ.

"Rothsay" suggests that neighbouring religious bodies should be treated with respect and affection, I presume, on account of the good that has been accomplished by others; but has it never occurred to him that their existence has been a great hindrance to the spread of Gospel truth, and that they have done an incalculable amount of injury to the cause of Christ, their conflicting doctrines having driven many into scepticism? Could we only make an estimate of the amount of injury done, I assume that we should find that it far outweighs the apparent good which is said to have been accomplished by them. Have they been so kind toward the

Church that it is incumbent upon us to reciprocate, *setting apart Scriptural reason?* I know not. It is patent to the world at large that they are never united unless when they are desirous of opposing the Church. "The Church," with them, is looked upon as a common foe, not by reason of her exclusiveness or conservatism, but simply because her disintegration might prove beneficial to them.

It is possible, "Rothsay" declares, for any one of us to know the Apostle's mind, and he assumes that he was a *liberal Churchman*. If preaching *unity* and exhorting to *avoid heresy and schism* is liberalism, then St. Paul deserves the character ascribed to him, for not only throughout his epistles does he, I may say, *emphasize unity* and condemn heresy and schism, but he even warns us to "mark these that cause divisions and avoid them." Even in the 27th verse of the chapter to which your correspondent refers in his last letter we read the Apostle's words as follows: "I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in *one spirit*, with *one mind*, striving together for the faith of the Gospel." "Rothsay" alludes to the denial of the authority and inability of the acts and orders of non-Episcopal, irregular workers; but he *simply assumes* that their orders are valid, and that their acts are authorized. He does not *prove* that they are valid. He does not show that it is Scriptural thus to assume ministerial authority, and exercise ministerial functions; but simply seeks to prove that they who do so are to be looked upon with a certain degree of allowance. You must not say that they are wrong. Rather fraternize with them, and gloss over their inconsistencies.

"Rothsay" state that "the great preponderance of Protestant Christendom is opposed to the idea of exclusive authority residing in Episcopacy," but *the great preponderance of Christendom* is in favor of it, and ever has been. He further states that scholars of *unequalled ability* are against it. The word *unequalled*, I think, is too strong, for I am confident that scholars of the *greatest ability* are very decided in their opinions in favor of it; but it is rarely a matter of opinion, for it has been clearly proved, times without number, that the Episcopal form of Church government is of Divine origin and Scriptural. "Both Luther and Calvin lamented the loss of Episcopacy, and professed their intention to restore it when it should be practicable." Melancthon deplored its loss. Doctor Coke and Mr. Asbury, the Methodist propagandists *eagerly sought* after Episcopal ordination for their preachers, and consecration of themselves to bishoprics; but they wanted it on their own terms, and failed therefore to obtain it. If these men were not believers in *Apostolic Succession*, why all this anxiety about Episcopal orders? Why did they not create a bishop for themselves? Simply because they considered themselves without authority. All these men have shown both by their expressed opinions, and by acts that they considered Episcopacy of *Divine origin*. And now, what about the preponderance of Protestant Christendom, when its originators not only believed in Episcopacy, but also regretted its loss, and sought after its re-establishment? It clearly shows that they stand as it were self-condemned.

"Rothsay" states that our own Church, in the past, has admitted the validity of non-Episcopal Orders. If she has, I am not aware of it, and have yet to hear of it authentically. This I know, that if a clergyman come to us from the Church of Rome, he will be received without re-ordination, whereas one coming to us from one of the sects will have to be re-ordained, a fact which defines clearly how such Orders are regarded by the Church.

Lastly, with regard to *unity*. That Church which has Apostolic Succession and the Creeds, and retains them as her rule of Faith, be it in England, Rome, Greece, Africa or America, is a branch of the true Church, that "Catholic and Apostolic Church" in which we profess belief, a Divine institution. The Church of England and the Greek Church have had intercommunion on several occasions, and if I mistake not, the late Dean of Westminster was an active agent in promoting it. "Rothsay" alludes to the *deadly errors* of the Romish and Greek Churches, but carefully passes over the *deadly errors* existing among the sects with which he would have us sympathize and patronize. Rome has not denied the Divinity of Christ; Rome has not deprived the infant world, two-thirds of the human family, of the sacrament of baptism; Rome has not *predestinated* some to everlasting happiness, and others to everlasting woe; but these acts, and more too, equally as serious, are chargeable upon the sects. It would be *worse than mockery* to join hands with the creedless sects; and I again affirm that the Apostolic Churches have unity in a limited sense, but not to that extent that is desirable. In our Church Catholic *there is unity*, that is, there is *lawful authority and the same Faith*.

"Rothsay" is anxious that reference shall be made to the *Reformed Episcopalians*. Well, in them we see an unmistakeable case of schism, *wilful schism*, without any redeeming feature about it, and as long as they remain in that state, we shall do well to follow the Apostle's injunction regarding such, namely, "to mark and avoid them."

In conclusion, I must aver that it is my opinion, based upon Scripture and the authority of the Fathers, upon the opinions of many of the most learned men of our own branch of the Church, also upon the acknowledgements of the Reformers,—that authority to minister in holy things is needed, and that authority must come from those who have the power to transmit it. I believe, also, that there