

fully finished inside having circular pews, neatly upholstered, and a good organ and choir adding additional interest to the services. The organ is presided over by Mr. A. Cook, who is quite proficient in music. In many respects Dr. Cook is a remarkable man, endowed with talents far above the average, and, possessing an iron constitution, has served the Church of his affections for over half a century. He has lived to see the "vine brought from Egypt overshadow the land." Warmly attached to the Church of Scotland, he has never faltered in his allegiance to the grand old Mother Church of his fathers, but having taken an active interest in promoting the union of the scattered branches of Presbyterianism in Canada, he was elected the first Moderator of the United Church.

A short time ago he retired from the active duties of the ministry and asked for an assistant and successor. May his evening of life be peaceful and happy, and may that Gospel which he for so many years preached to others be the joy and rejoicing of his own heart!

During the past winter the congregation extended a call to the Rev. A. T. Love, B.A., of St. Stephen, N. B. After serious consideration Mr. Love accepted the call, and is now successfully carrying on the work so well begun and matured by his venerable predecessor. Mr. Love is among the most talented and popular of our young ministers. Educated and ordained in Scotland, he possesses much of the traditional ability of his native country, a country which the pen of history has made classic, and which to latest posterity will be regarded as the guardian and protector of civil and religious liberty.

Across the river is Point Lévis, a city of 10,000 inhabitants, almost all French. We have one good congregation, ministered to by Rev. Mr. Anderson. He has the finest collection of stuffed birds in the Dominion. The Marquis of Lorne and the Princess Louise favoured Mr. Anderson with a visit, inspected his museum and remained for tea. The Royal party not only expressed themselves well-pleased with the collection, but they took a case home which I understand is now on exhibition in Kensington. Brother Anderson possesses all the qualifications of a New Testament bishop, but in a special degree that of "hospitality." "May his bow long abide in strength." K.

AN EPISCOPALIAN ON PRESBYTERIANISM.

BY THE REV. OLIVER J. BOOTH, ST. CATHARINES.

MR. EDITOR,—Some time ago I received the numbers of THE CANADA PRESBYTERIAN which contain the Rev. R. Wallace's paper on "Presbyterianism," to which (being allowed brief space by the courtesy of the editor) I shall attempt a reply, trusting that I may write, if not convincingly, yet, as he has written, in moderation, fairness, and brotherly love.

1. That there was a plurality of elders (called also presbyters and bishops) in the primitive Churches is readily admitted, and the special case cited—Ephesus—may be taken as proving it. I know of no Episcopalian who denies this. Indeed, it seems no more wonderful that there should have been many Presbyters in Ephesus and other cities than that there should be many to-day in the city of Toronto. But how the fact that there were many Presbyters in Ephesus could invalidate Episcopacy then I cannot understand, any more than I can understand how the presence of the numerous Presbyters of the Church of England in Toronto can invalidate Episcopacy now.

Again, in regard to plurality, he refers to Titus in Crete who appointed "elders in every city"—not one, "but many elders." The word "many" may be misleading. The plural only is used in the Epistle—why supply "many?" The plural may mean only a few. But whether few or many, the fact does not prove anything against the Episcopal view of the second order of the ministry. I quite agree with him, then, as to the plurality of elders in Ephesus and in the Churches of Crete. But I strongly suspect that he means to imply that every separate congregation had more than one Presbytery to oversee it, and that not only were there many Presbyters in Ephesus but also a plurality of Churches.

It may have been so. Perhaps the Church of God in Ephesus included many Churches (congregations) just as the Church in Toronto does to-day. Perhaps (I say perhaps, for it can never be proved—it is only

a matter of inference, and I may infer the opposite to him) certain of the congregations had more than one Presbyter, but this is no more an argument against Episcopacy than it would be were he to state that the Cathedral in Toronto is a non-Episcopal place of worship because it has a staff of three Presbyters—a plurality—to oversee it. Obviously, the bare fact of plurality proves nothing as against Episcopacy.

The texts, Rom. xii. 4-8; 1 Cor. xii. 28, I submit, prove too much for his argument, for while he makes the interpretation to square with his view, and get three, I, with no special point to make, get seven—Apostles, prophets, ministers, teachers, exhorters, rulers (presiders), workers of miracles (not Apostles). Is my view arbitrary? So is his. And so much for the divine right of private judgment.

2. His next point (made incidentally to bear towards his theory, that the pastor should not be specially a visitor, but should be more in his study than with his people, I cannot accept as it stands. The pastor, I think, can never greatly help his people unless from personal contact with them, heart to heart, he gets to know their griefs, and, in a sense, to carry their sorrows. And moreover, he preaches best who preaches by the earnest example of a holy life—not golden words, but a life of golden deeds tells with men as with God—and while study is necessary, and speech powerful, yet our lives are golden epistles known and read of men. Give me, of two good men, not the preacher, but the worker who carries a smile into poor homes, and who bears in his heart the sins and trials of his brethren—those sins and trials that can never be known or appreciated unless a man be with his people, and be diligent with them as St. Paul was "from house to house."

3. Concerning the special interpretations of special and particular writers about the Jewish Synagogues and the Christian Church, permit me to take exception to his phrase, "The most learned and candid" admit so-and-so. Why so? Because they agree with him? Who—what court of appeal—has declared them to be "most learned or candid?" And have not scholars, equally learned and candid, taken the opposite view?

4. Following this bracketed number he fills a column and a half in proving what no Episcopalian ever denied—that in Holy Scripture, "elder" and "bishop" are one and the same. Far down in the page he says: "Many (please note that word) of the most eminent and learned bishops and divines of the Church of England have admitted that in the New Testament the terms bishop, presbyter, or elder, are identical and refer to the same office."

Many? I shall be glad if he will give me the name of even one bishop or presbyter of the English Church who denies this. We all admit it! I must say it is very amusing to read, that among us "many admit" what none of us ever denied!

What we do most emphatically assert is that in the Holy Scriptures there are three orders of the ministry: (1) *Apostles*, of whom there were more than twelve, and to whom alone was given the power of conferring Orders—a power residing alone in their successors. (2) *Elders* (called also presbyters and bishops). (3) *Deacons*, who serve tables, and also preach and baptize. That is fact. There, in the New Testament, are the three orders—Apostles, Presbyters, Deacons. In trying to get rid of the difficulty, Presbyterians, I think, only prove the fact, for they assume the Apostolic office to have been temporary, and they assume still further that the deacons are only laymen. So far, then, we are in strict accord with Scripture, and point to three orders in the Church. We do not quarrel about names—we are concerned with things; and thus we have a three-fold Scriptural ministry—(1) Bishops—successors of the Apostles; (2) Presbyters; (3) Deacons—a ministry corresponding exactly with the Church of the New Testament and the Church of the first fifteen hundred years.

5. Here again he says "the most eminent divines of the Church of England" have believed that the persons to be ordained were "chosen by the suffrage of the people." Well, what of it? What does it prove? Does it prove anything against Episcopacy? Does it prove anything in favour of Presbyterianism? Our chief pastors are chosen by a vote of laity and clergy. The laity may choose, but they cannot ordain! "The most eminent divines!" Why, every bishop, presbyter, and deacon of the Church admits this mode as lawful. Why does he, and most Presbyterian writers, in this argument persist in making men of straw only for the sport of knocking them down again?

(To be continued.)

THE MUSKOKA MISSION.

MR. EDITOR, Your issue of the 8th inst. contains a reply from Mr. Sieveright, ordained missionary at Hunstville, to a previous letter from H. K., regarding the condition of our church buildings in Muskoka. Being a stranger comparatively in the country, or not being familiar with the history of certain localities—or, it may be, taking statements on trust without careful inquiry has led, in some instances at least to false impressions on Mr. Sieveright's part. In every case mentioned by Mr. Sieveright, or that can be mentioned, an explanation can be given that would take the point entirely from his statement. But, as the time has not yet come for writing the history of our work in Muskoka, I do not enter upon this now. I may say briefly, however, that we have no "wrecks" of churches in these two districts and, what is perhaps more remarkable, we have no church in all our mission field here with a mortgage on it. We have, however, twenty-one or twenty-two churches either completed or in process of completion, and hope to engage in the erection of six or seven more during the coming summer at different points in the field. "We have no manse north of Bracebridge," writes Mr. Sieveright. We have a very comfortable manse at Parry Sound, some fifty miles north-west of Bracebridge, and so on, and so on. We have a manse in every settled charge in these two districts, which is, perhaps, more than can be said of any other mission field of the same extent in the Church. If Mr. Sieveright would only present this woeful state of affairs as he finds it—to the Presbytery, he might have all his fears for the welfare of the work dispelled and such explanations given as would have satisfied any candid mind. I speak the mind of the Presbytery, and of many beyond our bounds, when I say that this method of spreading fancied grievances before the public without first consulting those who know something of the work or the Presbytery by whom Mr. Sieveright is placed where he is—to build up, not to pull down—is not at all desirable.

The work in Muskoka, I may say to the many friends of the district, is going on quietly but surely, notwithstanding all this outcry about "wrecks." The old fields are all occupied and several new ones—thanks to the kindly interest of the Missionary Associations of Knox and Montreal Colleges—are this year taken up. The people who have contributed some \$300, perhaps more directly to the Home Mission Fund of the Church during the past winter, evidence, thereby, an interest in the work of the Church at large, and are not likely to be indifferent to the prosperity of the work at home.

A. FINDLAY, Superintendent of Missions,
Muskoka, Parry Sound and Algoma.

Barrie, April 10th, 1885.

RECENT trials and convictions of Mormon polygamists in Utah have spread consternation among the leaders of the Latter Day Saints. The spring Conference has recently been held, but the magnates of Mormondom kept themselves concealed for fear of consequences. A Salt Lake correspondent of the New York Independent, who evidently has good opportunities of knowing the actual state of affairs, writes: It would be a mistake, most foolish and fatal, to imagine for a moment that as yet anything of great value has been achieved. The battle is joined, and that is all. The fierce death struggle has but just commenced, and is likely to last for months and even years. The monster is not killed, and not even scotched. Often, hitherto, Mormonism has been driven into a close corner. The priesthood is a very Proteus for wriggling; can turn somersaults most wondrous on shortest notice, and perform stunning feats of prestidigitation. It is safe to say that never has the nation been called to deal with men so wily, so full of tricks and low cunning, so utterly lacking in conscience and sense of honour. One looks in vain to Utah prophets, apostles and high priests for ought that is honest, open and straightforward. They have been drilled for a half-century in duplicity and the utterance of downright falsehood. Like polygamy, it is a part of their religion to lie shamelessly and commit perjury without limit whenever a point against their "enemies" or an advantage to "the kingdom" can be gained. So let Congress and the courts continue to strike their blows harder and yet harder until the theocracy calls lustily for quarter and makes unconditional surrender; and let all the people, through press, pulpit and platform, continue to thunder Amen!