

add an equally clear and cogent proof, of the same kind, that in the Primitive Church there were *three orders* of the ministry, bishops, priests and deacons. No man can offer an objection to the argument for the Church that I cannot parallel with a similar objection against the Scriptures.

Therefore, despite the heresies and schisms of past and present, I believe that the Apostolic Church lives now, has lived all along the ages; that it was not left for some man to create it 300, 200, 100, 50 years ago. I admit freely that at times there has been need of reformation, that corruptions have arisen which had to be cleansed, that there has been occasion often for changes in minor matters to meet the changed conditions in society. But I deny that the old Church ever died, and that a new church had to be created. And to find out where the old Church is I look first to see what society claims to be that old church; and if more than one makes such a claim, then I test their claims by an appeal to history; do they bear the marks of The Church of early days? Are their creeds, sacraments, ministry, worship, such in essentials as were hers?

If I found that the Bishop of Rome was in the early ages ruler over the whole Christian church, that he was regarded as supreme and infallible, and that the services were conducted in a tongue not understood by the people, and that the clergy were forbidden to marry, and that the laity were denied the sacramental cup, and that the creed had an article declaring the absolute sinlessness of the the Virgin Mary, and that the devotions taught the people were largely made up of invocations of the saints, and so on, then I should be a Roman Catholic. But not finding this the case I can only reject the claim of the Roman church to be the true modern representative of the society established by the apostles. Let this suffice for an illustration of the kind of reasoning applicable to the inquiry. What I wish mainly to urge is that if the Bible is true, there must be a true, historic church in all ages, and therefore now on earth, with its lines of succession, its "family tree," so to speak, perfectly visible. Such a church I claim to belong to. I believe in her because I can trace her historic life back to the first days, and because in doctrine, in worship, in government she is, as to all essentials, the same as was the church which held its first great council at Nicea and set forth that creed which has been the bulwark of the true faith concerning Jesus Christ, for all succeeding time. The Episcopal Church can trace the succession of her bishops back through the English church, the Gallican church and the Italian church, up to the days of the apostles. I do not exaggerate when I say that there is more complete evidence that the bishop of Missouri is in a line of actual, official ordination by the laying on of hands of bishop after bishop up to St. John himself, than there is that St. Matthew wrote his gospel. I accept St. Matthew's gospel, shall I not, must I not accept the Episcopate. Certainly what is sufficient to prove the Bible ought to be enough to prove the church. Of course I am only sketching a mere outline of an argument. I am trying to show the general reason for my belief and position. I cannot give the detailed proof of my assertions, nor can I dilate upon the peculiarities of the church system, upon her creeds, her forms of worship, her mode of government. I only say as to all these, that I accept her and therefore I accept her teaching and her institutions. Christ built the church upon the rock, and His promise was that the gates of hell should not prevail against her. I believe the promise has been kept. One word in conclusion to prevent a misapprehension which we often meet. Do I say that there are no Christians outside of our church? *most distinctly I do not so say.* I recognize every person man, woman or child, baptized with water in the name of Trinity as a member of Christ's

Holy Catholic Church. But because a number of such baptized people assembled and vote themselves a church, a regular subdivision of the one great society, they do not thus create any such regular subdivision. All people born in the United States are citizens thereof. But if a number of Missourians and Kansas should vote themselves, and all who occupied a certain area, a new state, that action would not make the state a reality. Their officers have no such power as belong to those of a real state. This is only a rough illustration, but it may suggest my meaning.

For I hold that no divisions among Christians are lawful (though they may be divinely overruled for good) except such as come from the mere national divisions of humanity. All American Christians ought to be in an American church, a church with wide freedom in all minor matters, but with apostolic succession for its ministry, ecumenical endorsement for its creeds, and reverent celebration of the two sacraments. I have said nothing on the second reason for my being a Churchman, personal experience, because a man's personal experience is no proof to any one except himself. In argument I rest the whole matter upon these two propositions:

1st. The evidence sufficient to prove the Bible is sufficient to prove the Church.

2nd. Evidence of the same kind and strength as does prove the Bible, exists to prove that the Primitive Church was one having no divisions except on national lines, with a *three fold ministry*, with a *simple creed*, with *forms of worship*, with the *two sacraments*, with various other rites such as confirmation, with no supreme head on earth, no pope, with large liberty in all subsidiary doctrines, with profound reverence for the Bible, and with positive insistence upon *apostolic succession* for its bishops. And such a church I find in this country (the U.S.) under the name of "the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America."

CAMERON MANN.

**NEWS FROM THE HOME FIELD.**

**DIOCESE OF NOVA SCOTIA.**

BISHOP ELLER.—It is now authoritatively announced that Dr. Courtney's consecration will take place (D.V.) in St. Luke's Cathedral, Halifax, on St. Mark's Day, April 25th. The consecrator to be the Metropolitan. The preacher, the Bishop of Quebec. The Bishop of Ontario and Bishop Kingdon are expected to assist.

**DIOCESE OF FREDERICTON**

WOODSTOCK.—By order of Rural Dean Hoyt a Special meeting of the Woodstock Deanery was held at Richmond lately. Eight clergymen were present, two of the number being heartily welcomed to the Deanery by the others: Revs. A. W. Teed, and H. Morris. A service at 8.30 a.m., with Holy Communion, was held in St. John's Church, when a large number of laymen partook of the sacrament with the clergy. Next meeting of Deanery is to be held (D.V.) at Centreville on June 12th.

**DIOCESE OF QUEBEC.**

QUEBEC.—The Cathedral was crowded on the morning of the 18th inst, to witness the induction of Canon Norman, as rector. The ceremony was performed by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese. The Churchwardens, Messrs. Edwin Jones and E. J. Hale, carrying the keys, and followed by the Rev. I. E. Rexford, and the Rev. H. G. Petry, curate in charge since the death of the late rector, led the procession from the vestry. Then came Dr. Norman and the Lord Bishop of the diocese. All standing together near the chancel steps, the Bishop said: "Brethren, we are here assembled together to induct the Rev. Dr. Norman as rector of

this Cathedral parish, and to institute him to have cure of souls therein."

Dr. Norman then read aloud the declaration of assent enjoined by the Canons of this ecclesiastical province, and signed by himself, signifying assent to the 39 articles, to the provisions of the book of Common Prayer, and to the canons of the Provincial and Diocesan Synods.

The Bishop having formerly inducted Canon Norman in the form presented by the Prayer-book, the keys of the Church were handed to the new rector by Mr. Edwin Jones, people's warden, and by Dr. Norman to the rector's warden, after making the usual declaration.

Then the Bishop and clergy entered within the Communion rails, and His Lordship read and handed to the new rector his letter of institution, presenting him with the Bible and Book of Common-Prayer, and the Induction service closed with the usual prayers by the Bishop and the new Rector.

Dr. Norman then delivered an able sermon on the Sacrifice of Christ's death, and at its termination made the following reference to his acceptance of his new position, and to the work and friends that he had left behind him in Montreal:—"I am very sensible of the honor that you have conferred on me, and very much touched by the mark of confidence shown me, not for the first time, by the revered Bishop of this diocese. I hope and believe that I shall not only enjoy your confidence, but that I shall never lose it. You can readily understand that it was not an easy task to severities and uproot associations which had existed for twenty years, and to turn my back upon a city where I have enjoyed the friendship and good will of so large a portion of the community. I was very much attached to those among whom I ministered, and my relations with those outside our Church were remarkably friendly and agreeable. But I considered this as a call which I could not put from me. It is not the first occasion that Church people in this diocese have kindly desired my service, and I could assign no valid reason for declining the invitation. I could only plead the natural disinclination to change, and the sorrow at having to break off pleasant ties and put an end to happy associations, reluctance increases with years. No one could ever have had more enjoyable work, than I have had in Montreal, and I consider this statement simply as a just tribute to the kindness of its citizens. But I come here, happily, not as stranger among strangers, but, I hope, as a brother among brethren. The welcome that I have received has been most hearty and gratifying, and I desire to express our thanks to him who, for so many months, has borne the ministerial charge of the parish. It is my prayer and my intention to work among you as a pastor and a friend. I cannot dis sever the two ideas. The clergy of our church are not a sacerdotal caste. Their intercourse with their people should be personal and social, as well as ministerial. In fact the latter relation can be much helped by the former. They should sympathize alike with the joys and griefs of their people. They should be trusted friends as well as clergymen. The intercourse between themselves and their people should be based on personal respect and esteem, as well as on the recognition of their sacred office; may such a feature characterize my relations with those whom I see before me. I should like to feel that the young people in this church will look on me as their true friend, and believe that I shall take a deep interest in their welfare, and derive pleasure from their society. I pray, that God may bless my efforts to your true good, and that when I have to render an account of my ministrations among you, it may be with hope and encouragement, and not with a conscience-stricken sense of deserved failure. May God prosper His work in this church and parish, through Jesus Christ Our Lord."