

two principles of Individualism and Centralization have led to the disruption of Christendom.

#### REMEDY: EPISCOPACY NOT PAPACY.

In this condition of affairs the Anglican Communion has called the attention of Christians to the 'Historic Episcopate,' along with some other conditions, as supplying a remedy. This peace-laden message, as we venture to think, contains the only remedy which can bring about union in western Christendom between the Anglicans and Easterns and Romans. For the Centralization, which, manifesting itself in the Papacy, has brought about the division of Christendom, has been developed by the degradation of the Episcopate. In order to magnify the Papacy in the Roman Communion, the Episcopate has been reduced from its rightful position as an 'Order,' to a 'degree' of the Priesthood. It was along with other measures, by practically destroying the divine symmetry of the threefold ministry, that the Papal supremacy was established. 'Contrary to the prevailing sentiment of the primitive Church,' says the learned Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of St. Andrews, 'first the schoolmen in a Pope's interest invented a distinction whereby, though they allowed Bishops to be superior to Presbyters in power and jurisdiction, they made them to be both of one and the same order.' Then too, by means of the powerful religious monastic orders, which they set free from Episcopal jurisdiction, the Papacy increased its domination. So it came to be held that 'the Pope alone has plenary jurisdiction in the Church, while all Bishops are merely his assistants for such portions of his duty as he pleases to entrust to them.' (Janus, page 169). The Pope gradually came to be the Ordinary of Ordinaries, having the whole world for his diocese, Bishops and Archbishops being only now his 'officials,' a position which is well illustrated by a remark of one of the Cardinals at the time of the Vatican Council. 'Just consider the monstrosity. This Archbishop (of Paris) desires to talk of the rights which belong to him! What would you say if one of your lackeys were to talk of his rights, when you gave him your orders?' It may be a long time before the Roman Church becomes emancipated from the worldly powers of Centralization, becomes converted and has the heart of a little child, and regains her spiritual insight, and casts away the Papacy as a man-made power, and is able to strengthen her brethren. But her restoration and the reunion of the east and west lies in the recovery of her Bishops, of the full Apostolic powers of their Episcopate.

#### RECOVERY OF CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD.

On the other hand, the remedy for Individualism with the losses of divine illumination and grace resulting from it, is to be found, by our separated sectarian Christian brethren recovering a realization of the Christian Priesthood. Until from the imperfect workings of their own systems they come to see that something of divine power is wanting to them, argument can make but little impression. We cannot make them see the need of the Episcopate and the Priesthood which is dependent on it, until they in some degree feel their loss. Just as they cannot convince a sinner of his need of Christ as a Saviour, until by the Spirit's action the soul is drawn to Him, we cannot effect them by our words. And they will not be helped by observing how those Episcopal clergymen live whom they happen to know or read about, who do not recognize their Priesthood; but how those laymen and clergymen become saintly, who place their whole lives under the influence of the Church's Sacramental system. A religious system should be tested only by its best. And therefore it is, as seeking for Christ's sake, our separated brother's best good, we desire they shall be partakers of all those special gifts of grace which depend upon the existence of the Christian Priesthood.

#### TWO CRITICISMS.

Here we would reply to two criticisms. Is it not impertinent on the part of a body so small as the Episcopal Church in America is, thus to address other Christians? The Episcopal Church, we are reminded 'is one of the smallest denominations in this country.' This is true; but the hand of an infant may hold in it a jewel, as well as that of a giant.

In pointing to the Historic Episcopate as a remedy, we are not denying the Christian standing of any baptized person, nor are we making it a condition of union that persons should join the Episcopal Church. We are pointing to the fact that 99-100 of all Christians have been Episcopalians, and that 4-5 of the Christians of the present day believe in Episcopacy; and realizing by practical experience the blessings which come from it, and that according to the best scholarship it was established by Apostles under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we desire they should be partakers of its blessings. For the Historical Episcopate is a means not only for the preservation of the Christian Priesthood with its Sacraments; but means a united Episcopate, where each Bishop merging his individualism in the solidarity, speaks in official utterances for the whole body of Christ, and so preserves the faith once delivered to the Saints.

But it has been said, that the replies of the Bishops show that 'the Episcopal Church will not give up anything for the sake of union.' It may be observed that all, or nearly all changes that were asked by the Presbyterians and others, of the English Bishops, to be made in the Book of Common Prayer, have been already granted by the American Church. It would require more space than we can give to recount them. And there is very little now in the Book of Common Prayer which conservative Lutherans or Presbyterians would object to. But we would point to one great change which has taken place in the government of the Episcopal Church in America which makes the problem of union very different in this country from what it is in England. In England the Bishop is practically the appointee of the Crown. He rules over his diocese, having no Presbyters as official counsellors, and his diocese is without any Synodical action, and the laymen have comparatively little power in Church affairs. In America all this has been changed. The laity have their voice in the election of their clergy and in members to the Diocesan Council. The Presbyters according to the primitive order of the Church gather in yearly Synod as a council around their Bishop. The diocese elects yearly a body of Presbyters and laymen, who act as the official counsellors of the Bishops, and restrain in many ways his official action. The system is practically a combination of Congregational, Presbyterian and Episcopal form of government. Dr. P. C. Campuall, the Presbyterian Principal of Aberdeen, writes in his book on 'Lay Eldership,' 'The Episcopal Church of the United States by its admirable Constitution, combines the advantages of the Presbytery and Episcopacy.'

The American Church is thus cleared from the charge of not being willing to give up anything. She cannot, however, admit that the ministers of non-Episcopal Societies are anything more than they themselves claim to be, for she knows that upon an Apostolic Episcopate depends the existence of the Christian Priesthood, with its blessed making and transforming Sacramental gifts. It is by the use of these that man is wrought into a supernatural union with the God-man, Jesus Christ, and made partaker of the Divine nature. A mere agreement of all Christians to a doctrinal platform, or interchange of pulpits, or an association together in philanthropic works, will be of little avail towards the resetting of the dislocated bones. The Church of Christ is not a human society, and union means something different from

agreement. Outward union must be of a deeper, fuller union with Christ. Only by this incorporation into Him, can the Church become one and strong. The Church of Jesus Christ is not going to be powerful by becoming a great human society; but it will become a more effectual instrument of the Holy Ghost by all its members becoming more supernaturally united, through the Priesthood and all the Sacraments that He has ordained, to its Living Head, Jesus Christ.

#### THE CLERICAL STAFF OF ALGOMA.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—A few weeks since the Rev. Dr. Mockridge published an article dealing with the future of the Diocese of Algoma! Upon the wisdom of his scheme I leave others more competent than myself to dilate. My object is to call the attention of our Bishop to a paragraph which some of the Algoma clergy regard as anything but complimentary, because therein the present staff seems to be held up before the public eye suggestive of a clerical "cave of Adullam!"

Here is the statement, copied word for word from THE CHURCH GUARDIAN of May 9th: "His best clergy leave him; missions have to be abandoned or given over to catechists, who, without university or college training, in time, from the despair of the Bishop, may be advanced to Holy Orders, as, indeed, has already been done in the past, without the mature preparation that they ought to have."

The persistent decrying of Algoma, from one pen and another, is not in the nature of things calculated to strengthen the Bishop's hands nor encourage his clergy! Taking the paragraph in question, let me ask: 1. Is it kind? 2. Is it true? 3. Will it serve the best interests of the diocese? The rev. gentleman's use of the term "best" in relation to the clergy needs to be defined! Does he mean by "best" those who possess a degree? If so the "best" are still in the field. Does he mean those who have given the longest period of service? If so the "best" are represented by the Revs. Rural Dean Liwyd and Chowne, and the Revs. Boydell, Machin, Colmor, Frost, and Young! Does he mean those who came into the diocese, not making the least of themselves, and, catching the public eye, became the recipients of a "call" to something better? If so, only two or three (owing to any superior ability) could be called "best" since the Bishop's report of 1889.

In that report the Bishop himself said of his clergy: "The calibre of our clerical staff has never been better." Has all the "calibre" passed away, and out of the diocese, since that time? If so, his Lordship's report of 1893 might be expected to give us a hint of this disaster! What is the fact? Why, that the majority of the clergy in charge in 1889 are here now, and I submit that the Rev. Dr. Mockridge was not entitled to publish any such reflection as above without first obtaining the sanction of the Bishop of Algoma! No wonder that a greater measure of prosperity has not been vouchsafed, if the Bishop has only promoted men to Holy Orders from the inspiration of "despair," and also (after 11 years of prayerful, faithful, and talented labour,) has simply collected together a clerical "cave of Adullam!" What diocese could look for it under the circumstances thus represented? I, myself, together with several others of our present staff, passed the examination required by the S.P.G. before leaving England, and I am not aware that a lower standard is permitted by the Board of that venerable Society, in order to alleviate the "despair" of any Bishop in Canada, than that which is required of their missionaries proceeding to other colonies!

June 7, 1894.

AN ALGOMA CLERIC.