

The Church Guardian,
A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER, PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IT IS NON-PARTIZAN.
IT IS INDEPENDENT.

It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, but its effort will always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

PRICE ONLY \$1 PER YEAR, PAID IN ADVANCE WHEN NOT PAID IN ADVANCE, \$1.50.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America
Address THE CHURCH GUARDIAN,
Lock Drawer 29, Halifax, N.S.

The Halifax Editor can be found between the hours of 9 a. m. and 1 p. m., and 2 and 6 p. m., at his office, No. 52 Granville Street, (up-stairs), directly over the Church of England Institute; and next door to the office of the Clerical Secretary.

THE COLLEGES AND THE GRANTS

Dr. J. G. McCREE, a Professor of Dalhousie College, Halifax, has been writing a series of lengthy and interesting articles on the College Question in the *Herald* newspaper, the purport of them all being to the effect that Higher Education in Nova Scotia is not what it ought to be, a position, we think, no one will feel disposed to question; that the University of Halifax has proved a great failure, a fact which has been very generally accepted all along; and that by the amalgamation of King's and Dalhousie Colleges, and the withdrawal of the Grants from the others, a strong teaching University, either in Halifax or Windsor, could be formed, which would prove a blessing to the country.

We are not so sanguine as the Doctor appears to be with regard to this latter proposition proving a panacea for all the educational ills he tells us we suffer from. Whether it would be so or not, if unanimously supported and faithfully carried out, remains to be seen; but while we feel confident that the authorities and friends of King's College would offer no opposition to the main features of the Professor's scheme, we are very certain, having in view the claims and influence of the other Colleges, that it is utterly impracticable at the present time. What we would suggest would be this: In justice to those bodies especially affected by the change, let the present Grants be continued for another five years, and in the meantime let a Commission be appointed to arrange a mutually satisfactory settlement of the vexed question; and let the Governing Bodies of King's and Dalhousie mature a wise and liberal basis for a union at the end of the period named.

THE BISHOP ELECT.

REV. HENRY TULLY KINGDON, M. A., of Trinity College, Cambridge, Vicar of Good Easter, Essex, has been elected by the Synod of Fredericton Conductor, on the Bishop's nomination. High testimonials were furnished by those who know him. It does not appear that Mr. Kingdon has been prominent in party strifes in England, or that he has identified himself with party organizations. He is a man unknown in literature, or as a reader or speaker at Congresses or great Church gatherings in England. But he has ample testimonials as a scholar, an earnest worker and a Christian gentleman. Some of the best of our Colonial Bishops have been taken from country vicarages, where they have been comparatively unknown, as for instance, Bishops Milman and Foild. We earnestly hope that the Diocese has secured one

who will be the leader of his clergy in zealous work, and around whom our laity will rally. The field here, with all its drawbacks, is an inviting one. Clergy and laity are disposed to give a warm welcome to the Bishop-elect. He will find us hearty and cordial in our reception of him, and willing to work loyally with him in advancing Christ's Kingdom. And coming amongst us, as we trust and believe he will, with no narrow nor contracted views, but disposed to act in a broad and liberal spirit, and with that toleration and fairness, for which the present Bishop is noted, we may hope to see a bright future before the Diocese of Fredericton. It is a matter of much thankfulness that the discussion was conducted with so much courtesy, and resulted in the hearty and harmonious acceptance of Mr. Kingdon.

MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

THE *Christian Visitor* says:—“For months and months the CHURCH GUARDIAN has bristled with articles on ‘‘Marriage with a deceased wife's sister.’’ One would almost imagine that the members of the Church of England are in a sad plight matrimonially. Can it be possible that there is a universal desire among the brethren of that church to marry their wife's sister. If not, why so much discussion on the subject?—*Wesleyan*.”

We hope that both the *Christian Visitor* and *Wesleyan* have profited by our articles to which reference is made above. To know that they have been benefitted, would simply repay us for the time and space consumed in the elucidation of the subject. For the information of our contemporaries, we are happy to be able to state that there is no universal desire among Church-people to violate God's Law in a matter fraught with so much danger to the well-being of society. Indeed, we do not believe that a score of members of the Church in the two Provinces could be found to sympathize with the proposed legislation.

It has been our object to make the subject so well understood that no sophistry on the part of the editor of the *Christian Visitor*, or any one else, would have the smallest weight with our readers. And we have modestly hoped to be in some measure a hindrance to the passage of so obnoxious a measure. Believing, most conscientiously, that Marriage with a Deceased Husband's Brother or with a Deceased Wife's Sister is forbidden in God's Word, as it has been by the Universal Church from the very first, we should be no safe GUARDIAN did we quietly look on while efforts promoted by those who have violated the law, were being put forth to make others partners and accessories in their guilt.

THE HISTORICAL CHURCH.

THE information asked for by our correspondent ‘‘A Subscriber’’ we are quite ready to impart, so far as it is possible to do so. We have more than once in the columns of the GUARDIAN given a connected account of the Church of England from her earliest known history, and we gladly seize the opportunity to repeat it here. We do not know of what nature our correspondent would desire to have the ‘‘Scripture evidence’’ which he asks for in proof ‘‘that the Church of England is the Church established by our Saviour.’’ We presume that he wishes us to show that she is a true Branch of the Catholic Church established by our Saviour when on earth as set forth in the Scriptures; or, in other words, that she possesses all the marks and characteristics of the Apostolic Church. When such claims are put forth as are put forth by the Church of England, it should lead Christians of every name to an examination of her position. For, we pray our readers to mark well, she does not pre-

fer to be a ‘‘sect’’ brought into existence by, and assuming the name of, some man three, or three hundred years ago. She repudiates any such position as containing within itself its own refutation and condemnation. The Church of England claims to be a true Branch of the Church established by our Lord and continued by His Apostles; and that her Bishop have been, in direct line, the successor of the twelve who were followers of Christ. Her position is that the Church of Christ is not only a Spiritual Body, but also an Historical Church—continuous, unbroken, perpetual, so necessary a condition in order to have fulfilled her Lord's declaration, ‘‘Lo I Am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’’

‘‘It is admitted by all, that our blessed Lord, when on earth, established a visible kingdom, or Church, against which He declared ‘‘The Gates of Hell should not prevail,’’ and to extend which, He commissioned the Twelve, who were to make disciples of all nations. It is not denied that they, along with St. Paul, who was soon after miraculously added to their number, obeyed their ascended Master; and that Churches were established in all parts of the then known world.’’

Thus, there were apostolic Churches of Jerusalem, Constantinople, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome; and the seven mentioned by St. John in the Apocalypse; and those at Ephesus, at Corinth, and on the Isle of Crete.

All of these, it is evident, were at the first separate and independent; each having its own apostle, angel, bishop, or overseer. As time rolled on, however, all did not prosper alike. Some rose or fell with the political fortunes of the city from which they took their name. Some had their candlestick removed for their lukewarmness and wickedness. Others, as Constantinople, Alexandria, and Rome, continued to maintain their existence and independence for centuries.

And from time to time, as the rise of some new error called for the testimony of the whole Church, as to the interpretation of an article or phrase of the creed—that form of sound words received by all—or as to some other disputed point, the whole Church met in solemn council, the various parts or branches of the same being represented by legates or deputies duly appointed.

The first and most famous of these General Councils was held at Nice, a city of Asia, in the year 325. Among the 318 Bishops present at this council, there were Bishops from Asia, Africa, Italy, Egypt, Spain, France; and (as is altogether probable) from the Islands lying to the west of the continent, and called Britain or Anglia.

By whom the Gospel was first preached in this part of the world, it is now impossible certainly to affirm; but it has ever been the current opinion that it was by none other than St. Paul. He tells us himself, that he intended to go to Spain. Clement Romanus, of the first century and Jerome, of the fourth, speak of his travelling ‘‘to the utmost bounds of the West,’’ of his preaching ‘‘as far as the extremity of the earth,’’ of his preaching the Gospel in the Western parts; expressions which were always anciently used (as has been shown by Bishop Stillington) with reference to the British Isles. Again, the historian Theodoret, writes A. D. 435, as follows: ‘‘Paul liberated from his captivity at Rome, preached the Gospel to the Britons and others of the West.’’ Our fishermen and publicans not only persuaded the Romans and their tributaries ‘‘to acknowledge the Crucified and his laws, but the Britons also, and Cimbric.’’ To the same purport is his comment on 2d Timothy 4-17—‘‘When Paul was sent by Festus on his appeal to Rome, he travelled, after having been acquitted, into Spain; and thence extended his excursion into other countries, and to the island surrounded by the sea.’’

Giving these statements due weight, and taking into the account the Apostle's burning zeal, and peculiar mission to the Gentiles, in connection with the fact that there is a period of about eight years between his last recorded act and martyrdom entirely unaccounted for, and we have strong presumptive evidence for the belief that the great Apostle was the first to break the spell of Druidism—to introduce the civilizing and humanizing influences

of the Gospel, and to lay the foundation of the British Church. There is every way greater reason for believing this than there is for thinking that St. Peter founded the Church at Rome, or was ever a Bishop there; of which there is not the slightest historical or scriptural proof.

But by whomsoever planted, we know that there was a Church in Britain in Apostolic times. We know that this Church had three Bishops at the Council held at Arles, in France, A. D. 311. We know that it had its Bishops at the Council summoned by Constantius, the son of Constantine, at Sardica, (the modern Sophia in Bulgaria,) in the year 347; and, again, at the Council held at Ariminum (now Rimini) in Italy, in 360. We also know that it was free and independent down to the beginning of the seventh century.’’

(To be continued.)

ROME'S LOSSES.

Below we publish extracts from a little work, of which we spoke a few weeks ago. The greater part of these converts have entered the Church of England, and are now, as her Clergy or Laity, rejoicing in their emancipation. Such a record must, of itself, make plain that the professed unity which Rome has been flaunting in the face of—alas!—a divided Protestantism, as existing within her Communion is fictitious and unknown; while, on the contrary, a wide-spread defection has shown itself, which, let us hope, will, in God's good time, so develop as to result either in the destruction or regeneration of the Roman Church.

We do not wish to convey the idea by any words of ours that anything is better than the Religion of Rome. Alas! sadly we must say it, there are evils even more to be dreaded than the seductive and soul-paralyzing influences of the Papal System.

The Roman Religion is Christian—corrupted, idolatrous, in a measure, but nevertheless containing within itself overwrought with error, the principles of Christianity, which will make a man wise unto salvation. The dangerous and subtle tenets of the modern irreligionists, of which the infamous Ingersoll is chief, would eliminate God altogether from their religion, and make the animal desires, and the natural bent of men's minds, their only guides and directors. ‘‘These as natural brute beasts, made to be taken and destroyed, speak evil of the things that they understand not; and shall utterly perish in their own corruption.’’

A pamphlet containing the names of those who have given their adhesion to the doctrines of the Roman Church was recently circulated widely throughout England. The title of the publication was ‘‘Rome's Recruits,’’ and an expression has doubtless been created in the minds of many who have read it, that the whole world is going over to the Roman Communion. But there is a brighter side of the question when regarded from a Protestant stand point: the number of converts to the Papal Church, as published in ‘‘Rome's Recruits,’’ is but small when compared with the far larger number of those who embrace the truth.

The chief object of the present publication is to record modern secessions of Priests, Monks, and Nuns from the Church of Rome. No attempt is made to give an extended list of lay-converts to Protestantism. Volumes might be filled with the names. Christian efforts which are being put forth in Roman Catholic countries, are blessed in the evangelization of immense numbers. Secessions from the Priesthood are of far more frequent occurrence than is ordinarily supposed. In 1848 the Abbés Migne, Clavel, and Genoude were deprived of their spiritual functions for daring to advocate liberty in religion. A law was passed in Austria, in the same year, permitting Austrian subjects of the Roman Catholic religion to embrace the Protestant faith. Dr. Nowotny, of Petersheim, in Silesia (himself an ex-priest), not many years since gave an account of fourteen Roman Priests who left their Church, between the years 1851 and 1857. In 1853 M. Clausel de Mentals

(formerly Bishop of Chartres), M. Cour (Bishop of Troyes), the Abbé de la Cour, and other ecclesiastics, strenuously protested against Ultramontanism. In 1854, the Roman ecclesiastical body became alarmed at the rapid progress of a spirit of enquiry, and Menseigneur Romilly (Archbishop of Milan), and Menseigneur de Charvaz (Archbishop of Genoa) joined in imprecations upon it. In the following year, the Abbé Laborde and many monks, particularly the Dominicans of the Convent of Minerva, rejected the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Also, in 1855 the Rev. L. Durand, reported that the Evangelical congregation at Nessonvaux consisted of three hundred converts. In 1857 the Archbishop of Utrecht, the Bishop of Haarlem, and the Bishop Deventer declared against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. In 1858, at Hechingen and its neighbourhood (Sigmaringen, in Germany), thirty-six Roman Catholics embraced Protestantism. The Rev. Mr. Tretzel gave in detail the cases of ten Bavarian Priests, whom he declared to be a real gain to the Protestant cause. He moreover mentioned that Professor Schmidt, of Erlangen, knew of no less than one hundred and fifty priests who were ready to quit their Church if they had the means to subsist after taking such a step. Again, Prelate von Kapff was the honoured instrument in receiving four priests into the Protestant Church. The conductors of the Priests' Refuge at Crischna report that, from July, 1857, to July, 1858, five other seceders gave evidence of true conversion to Christ. In 1859, at Oran, in Algeria, thirty-five Spanish colonists the majority heads of families openly embraced the reformed religion. The same year, five priests in Rome and Pavia were suspended from office and excommunicated for opposing the dogma of the Immaculate Conception. In 1860, help was asked through the medium of ‘‘Evangelical Christendom’’ for the subsistence of several priests in Lombardy, who wished to renounce their office. In 1862 a petition signed by 8,000 priests was forwarded to the Pope, praying for ‘‘the removal or rectification of indulgence, the Confessional, the superstitious worship of images and relics, the introduction of lay influence into the Councils of the Church, and the improved and liberal education of the priests.’’ In 1863 the Abbé Passaglia drew up an address to the Pope, praying him to restore peace to Italy by renouncing the temporal power. Such a petition, as may readily be supposed, met with little favour on the part of His Holiness. It was published, and it bore the names of 8,643 members of the Italian clergy, of whom 96 were Episcopal Vicars; 1,095 Monsignors, Canons of Cathedrals or Collegiate Churches; 783 Archpriests, Provosts, or Parish Rectors; 317 Chaplains; 861 Parish Vicars or Curates; 343 Doctors, Preachers or Professors; 167 Schoolmasters in Orders; 4533 Secular Priests; 767 Monks, &c.

A few years since three hundred liberal priests were suspended in Naples, and cast adrift on the world, because they declined to admit the ‘‘inalienable right of the Pope to the temporal power.’’ A great and good work is being done by the ‘‘Reformed Priests' Protection Society’’ of Dublin. It was founded in 1844, and since that time has given aid and protection to fifty-one priests and fifty-one students, who have left the Church of Rome. Through the ministry of Rt. Rev. Dr. H. C. Riley, in the city of Mexico, several prominent priests have been converted, and are now preaching the doctrines of Protestant Christianity.

The Rev. L. S. Tugwell, in 1875, reported that six Portuguese priests were searching the Scriptures, and had expressed a wish to join the Protestant Church. Signor Conti, in 1877, announced the conversion of French and Austrian priests, who had come on a pilgrimage to Rome. Three churches in Seville, which were a few years ago Roman Catholic places of worship, are in charge of missionaries who were formerly priests.

It is alleged, by some that only the unimportant and ignorant members of the Roman Church come over to our side in the list of Priest-seceders, however, which is now published, will be found the names of two Bishops (one of them Prince), two Vicars Apostolic, a Vicar General, two Abbots, a Prior, two Canon, a University Chancellor, a Synodal Examiner, a Bishop's Secretary, a Missionary-Apostolic, an Imperial Chaplain, a Chaplain Magistrate, a Provincial Physician, three Superiors of Convents, four