

ber and beyond computation. It is perhaps the least of them that in every village of a thousand inhabitants where there should be put one congregation, there must be now, four, five, or six, with all this enormously increased expenditure and waste of the church's resources. Each of these superfluous congregations also lies under the worst temptation to draw away the members of others to itself; and thus the Christian community in every village tends to become packs of wolves, in place of the lambs of Christ's fold.

Here certainly are strong words: yet do they not overstate but rather understate the real condition of affairs; and it is a great comfort to us to see how that there are learning—what we repeatedly have declared unto them viz; that to follow a rabbi now can not be less dangerous than it was in the days of old. It is one of the peculiarities of the Church of England for which we can not be too thankful to Almighty God, that when it was reformed, it did not take the name of any of its reformers. It is not the Church of Luther, or Calvin, or Ridley, but simply the Church. In other parts of the world it was not so; there, the Church lost its Catholic character, and became the Church of some one prominent man, who was its Rabbi and after whom it was called. Luther, Calvin, Knox, Robinson, Wesley and a multitude of others, founded religious organizations; usurped the place which of right belonged to God's ministers and are responsible for evils growing out of the present divided condition of the Christian world. Until very recently the Church, notwithstanding all occasional excitements and diversities of opinion has been preserved from the sin of schism. Some "have gone out from us because they were not of us," and their unhappy condition is rapidly showing itself in a Re-Reformed P. E. Church and an *imperium in imperio*, in which, as it would seem, each one desires only to be a bishop, that thus they might prove to the world that as they have all along been telling the world, "episcopacy is a matter of no consequence," and hence with wonderful consistency, no sooner does any one join the Reformers than he becomes a bishop.

And in many of our congregations this same spirit of the Rabbin manifests itself. People tell you they entered the Church because they "preferred it." Now, while it is perfectly true that there are a multitude of reasons why one should prefer the Church, yet at the same time, if any one is in the Church simply and solely because of his preference, he has made a sad mistake; for if his preference lead him into it, what can prevent him leaving it, if any thing should occur to change those preferences?

The fact is God has given us no preference at all in the matter. He gave us the Church and the Bible to aid us in our journey heavenward, and they are inseparable. Both are necessary for the salvation of our souls, and yet the Bible, that much abused book, is so far misunderstood by those who profess to make it, and it only the guide of their lives, that only the other day a preacher told his hearers that he thanked God that in his church "every thing, even the creed was determined by the votes of the members," thus making the truth of God to be as changeable as the whims and caprices of our very capricious American people.

We repeat it that any one who attends the Church simply because he was "in it" or because it is "convenient," or because he prefers the congregation or the minister, does not appreciate aright either his privileges or his responsibilities; and can be of little benefit to the cause. Responses, for, as so frequently happens, some slight trouble may arise and then he will leave the Church and endeavour to find in some other congregation a more congenial church affiliation," or in other words, a Rabbi more to his taste!

Now do not for a moment think I undervalue that feeling of affection which unites a congregation to their minister. There are some few parishes in our land where the clergy have been officiating for 20, 30 and even 50 years and may God hasten the day when there shall be more like them. You ought to love your minister and the members of the congregation, but you ought to love the Church itself more than any one person in it, otherwise you will be "making Rabbin of your friends, and will be tempted to follow them rather than God's will as made known in the Sacred Scriptures and taught in the Church.

Why is it that sometimes upon the death or removal of a rector, some of our churches immediately begin to decline? The reason can only be, the people in the church are not Churchmen; they do not love the Church, but only some certain few in it, whose favour must be earned and enjoyed though at the cost of the church itself and the sacrifice of every religious obligation.

Now, had such persons been well grounded in the principles of the Church and taught to love it, whether popular or unpopular, they would still cling to it in weal or woe, and would not have fallen into the sin of following a Rabbi.

Let us, then, beware how we act; let us not speak of the Church as "our Church" as though it were not the Church of all of God's creatures; let us not call it "Episcopal" only as though it were not at the same time truly "Presbyterian" and "Congregational"; let us not call it "Protestant" only as though it were not at the same time "Catholic," for it is all this—because being God's Church, and not man's, it is as many-sided as the truth itself, and embraces the whole truth, and not a mere portion of it.

What then is our duty? Is it not this? To hold fast the old Faith, not because it is the Faith of our parents or of the English Church in this nineteenth century, but the Faith of the "Catholic Church" in all ages. Christ is the Head of the Church, and we each are its members. Let us then practice true humility, not setting our opinions above the decisions of the undivided Church nor deviating in non-essential matters from the local usages of the congregation to which we belong, nor in any thing making the word of man of equal authority with the teachings of the Spirit as made known to us in the Church—the "pillar and ground of the truth."

Above all, let us have faith in Christ and the Church He established, living in peace with all who profess and call themselves Christians, of whatever name, loving them in spite of their errors, and by our own consistent living and believing doing all in our power to hasten the day when they, too, shall be in the one Church, perfectly joined together and living together as members of one family, the household of God.

### THE MOTHER CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

BY REV. R. W. LOWRIE.

(Continued.)

3. During all this while, there was but little infusion of Romanism; for the power of Rome was, at home even, very weak. But at last and by degrees, the British Church, though always bravely resisting *was* forced to yield very much to Italian ways and views. 1066, England was conquered by William of Normandy and the foreign influence greatly increased. Pretty soon, we see the National Church of England, though, of right, free and independent, reduced to almost the condition of abject vassalage. Still, she continued the National Church. Condition is one thing; identity, another. America receives yearly thousands of German and other foreigners and remains America still. And so the English Church in spite of all the importation of foreigners and foreign customs, was still the English Church. She was, however, in a most deplorable, low condition. She was, hardly more than an ecclesiastical colony—a dependence of Rome. But as the land of England when a Roman colony, made so by the arms of Caesar, rose up and achieved her civil freedom so now the Church of England, with great courage, rose up and won her ecclesiastical liberty.

4. Wickliffe was her pioneer reformer. In 1375, he protested against certain Romish abuses; and called on the English Church to maintain her inalienable rights. One hundred and fifty years before the days of Henry the Eighth, the English Churchmen had, thus, begun the work of reforming the abuses of several centuries. Before his time even, Dunstan, Potlock, Foliot, Greathead, Bradwardine, Fitzalph and others had prepared the way for him. After the death of Wickliffe, his work was taken up by Lutter, Rogers, Hooper, Taylor, Ridley, Latimer, and others of whom the world was not worthy; the opportunity conferred by Henry the Eighth, with the then Bishops of Rome, concerning the divorce of the King from Katherine, affording great assistance to the cause of

Reform, by lending the ecclesiastical movement the help of the civil arm.

The work of reforming the English Church is, by some, ignorantly referred to King Henry VIII. Some even absurdly think that this King "organized" the Church of England! Kings, however, do not originate Churches. Least of all would a Roman Catholic Monarch spend his time in starting what is sometimes called a "Protestant" Church. Henry lived and died a Romanist. He wrote a treatise in defence of Romish views, and the "Pope" dubbed him "Defender of the (R. C.) Faith." In his will, Henry left money for the saying of masses forever for his soul. Strange if so radical a Romanist should employ himself in the anti-Romish work of reforming the Church Catholic in England of all Italian error and evil. Truth is, Henry cared nothing for Reform. But he was so bent on Divorce, that he was willing to allow reform to go on unchecked and unchecked in fact, greatly aided and abetted by the throne, because he saw in it, a safe and speedy stopping stone to the accomplishment of his matrimonial projects. The Church wished to be rid of Pope and Papacy for one reason; the King, for another. And thus, the civil arm upheld the ecclesiastical.

Henry died in 1547. Edward became King, a boy of ten. Queen Mary followed with a bloody reign of five years and a half. Elizabeth came to the throne in 1558. The Reformation was now resumed and very actively pressed. And mark that it was a Reformation, and not a Revolution! To re-form is one thing; but it is another to re-volve, i. e. overthrow everything. No new Church was founded; the old one was restored.

5. Some may tell you, that, one by one, Englishmen had grown tired of abuse, and gone out of the old English Church, and set up a new English Church; that some of these came to be leaders and finally, Bishops; and that, soon a Prayer Book was composed, the Bible translated, and this new creation recognized by the State in place of the ancient Church of the land. Not so. This movement would not have been Reformation, but Revolution. On the Continent, new religious bodies were started by Luther, Calvin, and others; but in England, the old Church was preserved; only excrescences were cut off; ceremonies were altered, and abuses remedied. But the same Bible was used; the same three orders of the Ministry were retained; the same Liturgy, though wisely purged; the same mode of Church government; the same Divine sacraments; the same creed; the same essential doctrines; even the same Diocesan and parochial divisions and machinery. Thus did she remain the identical Church; the Old Catholic Church of England—the same after, as before, the Reformation.

6. Make, always, a careful distinction between condition and identity. This is frequently thus illustrated: cleanse a garden of weeds—convert a wicked man—reform a drunkard—wash a child's face; homely comparisons—but are not garden, evil-doer and child the same before and after this change? Even so is dear Mother Church of England the identical, historic Church planted on British shores in the first century of Christianity.

7. It was in 1534 that the breach between Henry and the "Pope" began. For several years the Church pushed on her work of Catholic Reform of Roman Catholic abuse. In 1559, her Reformed Prayer Book went into general use. For twelve years during the reign of Elizabeth, the Romanizing party attended the Reformed Catholic services, and the Holy Communion included. Two "Popes" offered to recognize the Reformed Liturgy, if England would acknowledge the "Pope." At last, those who feared the Bishop of Rome, seceded; at the inauguration of Papal emissaries, from the Church of their forefathers and of their native land, and organized the Roman Church in England. History asserts these facts: that Reason answer which is the old—that which swarmed, or that which remained in the life!

8. In 1611, the present version of the English Bible was given the world by the Bishops of England. In 1640, many religious bodies withdrew from the English Church; and afterwards, the Methodist, also. In 1784, and 1787, the Scotch and English Churches sent the United States the Episcopal in the consecration of Bishops: Seabury, White and Provost. God bless dear Mother Church of England.

Canada received the Episcopate in 1787. (Hos.)

### Correspondence.

#### ST. PAUL'S PARISH WORK.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

DEAR SIRS,—Your readers must be very pleased to be told by "Aurus" and another writer of the good work that is being done by the Rector and Parish of St. Paul's. One of the statements made by "Aurus," however, has sent me to this year's report of the Board of Home Missions, and there is an apparent discrepancy between the two.

"Aurus" states "St. Paul's and her members have done more to assist the poorer outlying Parishes and Missions than any Church in the Diocese." Yet I read in the report of contributions, from—

St. Luke's.....	\$794.08
Bishop's Chapel.....	205.50
St. Paul's only.....	184.73

This seems to be the more remarkable as, contrasting St. Paul's with St. Luke's—and the contrast is more marked as respects the Bishop's Chapel—I understand the Parish is twice as large, has three times the wealth, enjoys an income of \$1200 a year from glebes; whereas the smaller and poorer Parish of St. Luke has no glebes, and is in every respect self-sustaining.

Will "Aurus" be so good as to explain? AUGUSTUS.

#### REPORT OF THE BOARD OF HOME MISSIONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

SIRS,—The other evening, in looking over the Report of the Board of Home Missions, which I had just received, my attention was arrested by the comparison of the subscription lists for 1877, 1878, and 1879. This comparison, says the Board, "shows a favorable result." The lists, as stated in the Report, are, for 1877, \$4137.71 for 1878, \$3542.45; and for 1879, \$4881.09, to which is added a sum of \$419.19 collected by the Secretary, making the total for that year \$5299.28. The increase of the subscription list of 1879 is, therefore, \$1161.57 over 1877, and \$756.83 over 1878. And "this fact," the Report says "of itself proves that the people are waking to a sense of their responsibilities."

But figures are often misleading; and I am afraid they are so in the present instance. The first impression that a casual reader would receive from the Report would be that the income from subscriptions of the Board in 1879 was within a fraction of 25 per cent. more than that of 1877, and 49 or 50 per cent. in excess of 1878; which, if a fact, would most certainly "prove that the people are waking to a sense of their responsibilities."

But the Report itself contains no evidence of any such fact; and it is impossible to gather from it what the income of the Board from donations and subscriptions for 1879 really was. Wishing to institute a comparison of the receipts of the three years, I took the Report for 1877 and 1878, and from page 13 of the Report for 1877, and page 13 of that for 1878 learnt that the total receipts on the General Account for these respective years were \$5216.68, and \$5132.42. But these receipts included interest on investments, &c., which had to be deducted. I turned, therefore, to the table of "Receipts by the Treasurer," added all the receipts for "General Purposes," and subtracted the interest on investments, and in the case of 1878 two or three sums received for the "S. P. G." and "Mission," and the result I obtained was that the income for "General Purposes" from voluntary contributions was, in round figures \$450.00 in 1877, and \$4200.00 in 1879. But turning again to the Report for 1879, I found the data for a comparison were wanting. There is no summary of receipts such as are always found in the Reports prepared by the late Secretary; while the Treasurer's account, and the "Returns from the Parishes from May 1st, 1879 to January 16th, 1880," are of no value for this particular purpose.

I then turned my attention, to the lists as they appear in the Reports, and the only result was an increase of perplexity. The figures in the Reports are for 1877, \$4137.71; 1878, \$3542.45; 1879, \$4881.09, exclusive of the amount collected by the Secretary, \$419.28, inclusive of that amount. My figures obtained by adding the lists as they appear in the Reports, are 1877, \$4261.79; 1878,

\$677.88; 1879, \$4411.57. In all these lists are included subscriptions to and collections for the Widows and Orphans' and Superannuation Funds, and in that of 1879, certain sums collected by the Secretary. The Bishop's donation of \$200, which does not appear in the lists, is not included in my figures for 1879, and I presume not in the Report, as it has no tendency to 'prove that the people are waking to a sense of their responsibility.'

The figures in the Report have, doubtless, been obtained from data which it does not itself contain, and to which I have no access. But however this may be, it is, I think, much to be regretted that we should have given to us as a guide to the financial state of the Board of Home Missions during a transitional period like the last two years, when a new rule, excluding from publication in the forthcoming Report all lists which are not in the Secretary's hands before the 1st of January has been introduced, (if not strictly enforced) only a comparison of the subscription lists for this transitional period. For these lists do not tell us what the income of the Board is in any given year; they tell us nothing certain about the prospects of the years in which they respectively appear. A list is often published in the Report of one year, while the subscriptions represented by it go into the treasury of the year following. And it seems not improbable that the result of the new rule, to which reference has been made, may have been the omission from the Report of 1878 of the lists of some parishes in which the work of the Board has been steadily continued. At all events, some special causes must have been at work to prevent the appearance of the names of certain parishes and missions. Antigonish, Dartmouth, Digby, Port Medway and Yarmouth, not to mention less important places which have been steady supporters of Home Missions, are conspicuous by their absence from the Report of 1878. A comparison of the lists made at such a time, and under such circumstances, is surely most fallacious as an evidence of the interest which the people of the Diocese generally are taking in the work of the Board. A comparison of those parishes and missions which appear in the Reports both of 1878 and 1879 is more to the purpose. And there is an increase of \$300 in favor of the latter year, an increase which, "taking place in the year of greatest depression," calls for thankful acknowledgment and inspires with hope, but a very different thing from the increase of \$1,756.83 which the comparison of the lists in the Reports shows, but which I cannot reach within \$9.00 by the simple process of arithmetical addition.

I will not adduce any more figures, for probably the only result would be to weary such of your readers as may venture to peruse this, and more thoroughly to confuse myself.

It may be a very easy thing to remove the confusion. But the Report itself does not furnish the information necessary for the purpose. And I scarcely think that I shall be alone in regretting that, instead of a comparison of subscription lists, we have not been favored with a statement of the total income of the Board for "General Purposes," derived from donations, subscriptions, and collections, for the year 1879, together with an estimate of the probable income for the present year, based on the lists received before the 16th of January last, but paid since, and on the lists already received for the present year, and almost certain to be paid before its close. Such a statement, and such an estimate used formerly to be given, and then we knew pretty accurately the position we were in.

Has there, or has there not, been such an increase in the income, as the comparison of the lists would seem to indicate? I, for my part, should be overjoyed to learn that such was the case; and if my letter draw forth an assurance from the Secretary that it is so, it will not have been written in vain.

In conclusion, I would ask whether, having already decided to publish in the Report of any particular year, those lists only which have been received during the course of that year, it would not be well to go a step farther, and publish only those that have been paid in before its close.

As the subject and tenor of my letter are scarcely such as should appear over a non des plume, I subscribe myself

Your obedient servant,

Sydney, O. B., Nov. 8th, 1880.