ministers of e, boastingly Thurch, that id ministry. tely forbids or Bishop of the same man has a ven though if he carry er;" and so **Episcopal** l views any hem as an e Church; rit of the it is not er people. nion who hank God earts beat f God and h, in the ife made city, the it silent-: Church ple, and

Church m was, 's com-lliance. ess, of was a h. It from eeting and it

was surely most appropriate that, at the close of their meeting, and before parting never to behold one another's faces again in this world, they should gather as the members of one great and blessed family around the table of their Common Lord. And yet for taking his place at that table and uniting with Christian brethren of other Churches in that sacred service, Bishop Cummins was denounced in the most unmeasured terms, was accused of having violated the Constitution and Canons of the Church, and was charged with having been unfaithful to the most solemn vows a human being can assume.

Now, were these charges false, or were they true? I do not discuss this question so far as Bishop Cummins is concerned. He needs no defence at my hands. His character as a Christian man and a Christian minister stands unimpeached before the Christian world. In the freshness and strength of his early manhood he took upon him the vows of God and devoted himself to the service of God in the ministry of the Gospel of Christ; and sacred, faithfully, and with his whole heart, so far as the eye of man can see, and with signal marks of Divine blessing upon his work in every station he has occupied, has he from that day to this remembered and kept those vows to God. And in now laying down his office in the Episcopal Church, and in going forth to labor in a new field, where, as he honestly believes, he may yet more faithfully serve God and His cause on the earth, he has done what, as a Christian man, he had a perfect right to do, has done it in the most manly, and honest and straightforward way, and has done only what the Reformers of the Church of England did when they came out of the Church of Rome.

But I ask the question because of its bearing on the attitude of the Episcopal Church to the other Churches of the Reformation. And on this point there is this sad and significant fact: While Bishop Cummins was so loudly condemned for that Communion act, there was, so far as I know, but one paper in the entire Episcopal Church in this country which spoke out in fearless, and honest, and hearty terms, in defence of him and in justification of his act. Surely this single fact clearly marks how far the Episcopal Church has already drifted from her ancient Protestant moorings, and no one who has watched for the last few years the course of the current of public sentiment in her Communion can question that she is