

A MARITIME CHURCH CONGRESS.

No one in these days of successful Congresses and Conferences of Clergy and Laity will doubt the wisdom or utility of a Congress of Representative Clergy and Laity from Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to hear papers and discussion on the practical living issues before the Church of England to-day. We are convinced that such a movement would be popular. The difficulty appears to be in taking the initiatory steps for holding the first meeting. There is, of course, no one authorized to call such a meeting. The only way that can be overcome, is for a few persons from the two Provinces to constitute themselves into an informal committee, arrange the subjects, readers, and place of meeting after consultation with each other, and then issue the invitations to the Congress, and work up as much interest in it as possible. Supposing the Conference to be held in the Fall, it is not too soon to begin agitating the matter. The writer of this can say for several of his brethren in New Brunswick, to whom he has spoken on the subject, that they are willing and ready to promote such a movement. No doubt, there are many in the Sister Province who are equally willing to help. If any one in Nova Scotia will undertake to secure four or five roughly representative clergymen, and four laymen, who will act as a Committee, the New Brunswick editor of this paper will agree to secure the same number from New Brunswick, each to elect a Corresponding Secretary, and the subjects, time and place of meeting could then be arranged by correspondence, if a meeting is impracticable. The columns of the CHURCH GUARDIAN are open to communications on this important subject.

CHRISTIAN GIVING.

PROFESSOR ROE'S sermon, which will be found on page two, is of so practical a nature, and yet, as he has shown, the subject is of such vital importance to the development of the Christian character in every one, that we cannot do better than by giving it in *extenso* allow him to bring his views in his own language before our readers; and we ask for what he says the thoughtful consideration of our Clergy and Laity.

While the Professor's sermon will have brought the subject of Christian Giving before the laity in a new light, let us hope that it will make them more conscientious and systematic in their offerings; and it ought to give the clergy fresh courage and energy as they see how necessary a position Giving occupies in the religious training of their people.

If both Clergy and Laity will take the sermon to heart, the Professor may hope to see much fruit from it as the result of his earnest and practical treatment of the subject.

THE *Christian Visitor* makes the following most erroneous statement in its editorial columns:—

"The Bishop of Manchester, who is a Ritualist, said in a recent sermon, that—'after the consecration of the elements (in the communion) by the priest, every crumb in the paten, and every drop in the chalice, is the whole body, soul, spirit and divinity of Jesus Christ.'"

The Bishop, who is about as little of a "Ritualist" in the popular acceptance of the term as a man can be, never made such a statement as the expression of his own sentiments. We quite agree with our correspondent "H. H. N.," that the *Visitor* should be more careful.

If we profess to be members of the true Church of Christ, it is our duty to "Search the Scriptures" habitually and daily, with fervent prayer for the help of the Holy Spirit. The command is express, the obligation universal, and the benefit immense.

PROTESTANT RECRUITS:

A Record of Modern Priests, Monks, Nuns, and Theological Students, who have left the Church of Rome.

(Continued.)

The names of very many, who fear persecution, are withdrawn from publication.

Rev. Michael McCartan, Priest, Diocese of Drogheda, Province of Armagh, Ireland.

Rev. Murtagh M'Sweeney, Priest, Diocese of Kildare and Leighlin, Province of Dublin, Ireland.

Rev. John Madden, Priest; Curate of Roscommon, Diocese of Elphin, Province of Tuam, Ireland.

Rev. Signor Mariani, Priest, Italy.

Rev. Paul Marre, Parish Priest of Haravilliers, Seine-et-Oise, France.

Rev. Don Jose Perez Martimon, Priest, Cordova, Andalusia, Spain.

Rev. Ambrose Martin, Priest and Professor, Liverpool, Diocese of Liverpool.

Rev. Abbé C. Massiot, Priest; Vicar of the Parish of l'Abbaye aux Bois, Paris.

Rev. Ramon Monsalvatge, O. S. F., Priest and Friar, Order of the Capuchins, Besancon.

Rev. John Moran, Priest, Diocese and Province of Tuam, Ireland.

Rev. Laurence Morisy, Priest, The Penitentiary, Dublin, Diocese and Province of Dublin, Ireland.

Rev. Fr. Mulholland, Priest.

Rev. Joseph D. Mulkerns, M. R., B. Priest; Missionary Rector of Widness Dock, Lancashire, Diocese of Liverpool, England.

Rev. Jeremiah Murphy, Parish Priest of Castlemaine, Diocese of Cloyne, Province of Cashel, Ireland.

Rev. Fr. Murray, Priest, Diocese and Province of Tuam, Ireland (late of Mil-town, County Clare, Ireland).

Rev. Francisco Da Paula G. Nigil, D. Priest, Lima, Peru. (Declined the Roman Archbishopric of Lima, and other Peruvian Sees.)

Rev. Fr. Nowotny, Priest, Bohemia.

Rev. Louis Naud, Priest; Curé of St. John Baptist, Canada.

Rev. M. Nevan, Priest, Paturages, Province of Hainault, Netherlands.

(To be Continued.)

Correspondence.

The columns of THE CHURCH GUARDIAN will be freely open to all who may wish to use them, no matter what the writer's views or opinions may be; but objectionable personal language, or doctrines contrary to the well understood teaching of the Church will not be admitted.

THE HISTORICAL CHURCH.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Apropos, and as a fitting sequel to your concise and timely papers on "The Historical Church," I append some thoughts suggested by a conversation with, and private letter from, one of the most diligent students of Holy Writ and ancient authors of this or any age. You are at liberty to publish them if you see fit. May I be allowed to suggest that you now favour your readers with a paper or two on the causes, or circumstances, (more civil than ecclesiastical), between the date of Augustine's death and the reign of the vacillating King John, by which the influence of the Bishop of Rome in England was gradually strengthened, till at last the galling yoke of a foreign oppressor was placed upon the neck of a free and independent Church? I congratulate you most heartily on the success of the GUARDIAN, which delights me by its weekly visits, and is one of the five Church papers of our time. Go on and prosper.

ANDREW GRAY.

Chelsea, Mass., Feb. 4th, 1881.

"ONE HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH."

By these four marks or notes a true Church can always be distinguished from a mere human society. The genuine always possesses all of them; the counterfeit in every case is without some of them. By a reference to the 2nd chap. of the Acts of the Apostles, we find that the Church possessed these four notes—Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity and Apostolicity—at her birth, the day of Pentecost: (1) *Unity*. "They were all together with one accord in one place." (2) *Sanctity*. "They were all filled with

the Holy Ghost." (3) *Catholicity*. There were devout men out of every nation under heaven," &c. (4) *Apostolicity*. All the Apostles were there.

So much for the beginning; now for the end. In the Revelation the exile of Patmos gives us a picture of what the Church will be in her triumphant condition, and in that picture these four notes or marks appear even more emphatically.

1. *Unity*. "All are before the great white throne" with one accord, animated with one purpose. 2. *Sanctity*. They are all clothed "in fine linen, clean and white: for the fine linen is the righteousness of Saints." 3. *Catholicity*. Besides the 144,000 St. John "saw a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people and tongues." (7: 9) or as the idea is expressed elsewhere, (5: 9) "Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us unto God by Thy blood out of every kindred, and tongue, and people and nation." 4. *Apostolicity*. The Apostles are all there on their thrones, and their names are on the foundation stones of the New Jerusalem. If, then, the Church has these notes, features, or marks, at her birth, and in the end, does she lose them during the intervening ages? I say, emphatically, No, and let others do as they may, I must find my place in the Church which has these features. I believe the Anglican Branch has vital union with the "One Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church," and therefore she is my mother. And I desire to imitate those early Christians who "continued steadfast in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking bread and in prayers."

THE POLICY OF NEGATION.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—The "School of thought," usually termed Evangelical, is undergoing a strange transmutation.

"By faith ye are saved" was their motto which, intentionally or otherwise, make some think that works were excluded.

Now, it would be consistent with the notions of some of them if they declared "by faith ye are not saved."

"Such ornaments shall be retained" is read "such ornaments shall not be retained." And now this policy is exhibited in the S. School questions furnished by a paper ostentatiously called "Evangelical." The admission into the body of Christ by baptism is denied its Gospel power and grace. The Church Catechism says of baptism, "wherein I was made a member of Christ a child of God and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven. This wonderful 'Churchman' par excellence "Evangelical," says, "Does outward baptism make us members of Christ? No."

I need say no more, I hope, than "CAVE."

P. S.—On second thoughts I will add a quotation from the Rev. Chas. Simeon from whom the term "Simeonites" was applied to Evangelicals (so called): "In the Baptismal Service we thank God for having regenerated the baptized infant by His Holy Spirit. Now it appears that in the opinion of the reformers, regeneration and the remission of sins did accompany baptism."

BISHOP OF MANCHESTER A RITUALIST!

N. B., Feb. 5th, 1881.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—I enclose herewith a short paragraph, copied from the *Christian Visitor* (Baptist) of the 2nd of February. This statement is so clearly untrue that I think it should not be allowed to pass unchallenged.

1. The Bishop of Manchester is notoriously not a Ritualist.

2. Where and when did the Bishop utter the words thus attributed to him? The assertion is probably as untrue as that declaring Bishop Fraser a Ritualist, the words being by themselves, without explanatory context, an assertion of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is denied by the Prayer Book quite plainly.

3. The Ritualists certainly do not claim to be a part of a Protestant brotherhood, but a part of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ.

If the *Visitor* would be at the pains of acquiring a little knowledge concerning the Bishops, and in fact the Church generally, it would avoid placing itself in the ridiculous position which such statements cause it to hold in the eyes of all well-informed persons.

If our sectarian brethren must attack

the Church, we surely have a right to demand a little adherence to the truth.

Yours,

H. H. N.

"The Bishop of Manchester, who is a Ritualist, said in a recent sermon, that—'after the consecration of the elements (in the communion) by the priest, every crumb in the paten, and every drop in the chalice is the whole body, soul, spirit, and Divinity of Jesus Christ.' And yet, after all this wholesale surrender to Rome, Ritualists wish to be considered part of a Protestant Brotherhood. Romanists are much more consistent and logical than many professed members of the Church of England."

COLLEGE GRANTS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—On March 16, 1876, the *Church Chronicle* had a leading article of which I copy a part as a good answer to the proposals of Professor MacGregor of Dalhousie College.

"Of course if the friends of religious education could be brought to adopt the views of the secularists if the various boards and faculties could be coaxed or urged into performing upon themselves 'the happy despatch,' then it would be very different."

But he must be a very sanguine secularist who would persuade himself that this is at all likely to happen. Unless we greatly misread the signs of the times, the Secularism in education has reached its height, and the ebb has set in. Thoughtful educationists are looking with more and more disfavor upon a system which (if it has not produced) is at least contemporaneous with the fearful irreligion and infidelity in Germany, and which has educated the United States in such a way that they are at present the most politically corrupt civilized nation on the face of the earth.

Thirty or forty years ago we were told that secular education was to purify, elevate, do everything. Canal Rings, Whiskey Rings, Credit Mobilier Frauds, the most widespread political corruption in the new world are some of its results. In the old world, the most highly educated country has passed a law, no longer making religious services necessary at marriages, and separating registration from baptism. A harmless law in many countries, one that has been for some time in operation in England, but in highly educated Prussia, in the birth-land of Protestantism the effect of it has certainly been marked and peculiar. The German Protestant Pastor's salary is very small. It was from marriage and baptismal fees he got his living. Now that the Pastors are not compelled to go to their Pastors they stay away from them, and they are starving. Scarcely any one is coming forward for the ministry. In short, to use a colloquial but descriptive phrase, "the bottom has dropped out" of the Evangelical Church of Prussia, and the country seems to have been given over to unbelief.

Perhaps the Secularists would listen to one of their own prophets, Herbert Spencer, who certainly does not expect as much from secular education as do some of his admirers. "Few," he says, "I suppose will deliberately assert that information is important and character relatively unimportant. Every one observes from time to time, how much more valuable to himself and others is the workman who, though unable to read, is diligent, sober and honest, than is the well taught workman who breaks his engagements, spends days in drinking and neglects his family. And comparing members of the upper classes, no one doubts that the appendicitis or the gambler, however good his intellectual training, is inferior as a social unit to the man who not having passed the approved curriculum, nevertheless prospers by performing well the work he undertakes and provides for his children, instead of leaving them in poverty to the care of his relations. That is to say, looking at the matter in the concrete, all see that for social welfare, good character is more important than great knowledge. And yet the manifest corollary is not drawn. What effect will be produced by artificial appliances for spreading knowledge is not asked. Of the ends to be kept in view by the legislator all are unimportant compared with the end of character making, and yet character making is an end wholly unrecognized."—*Study of Sociology*, Chap. XV.

In view of such facts and opinions as are given above, it is most unlikely that the cause of Secularism will be any

stronger ten years hence than it is to-day. It is well in discussing this College Grant matter to go to the root of the subject. The real question at issue is Secular Instruction versus Religious education, and on this line it should be fought, though doubtless the Secularists would like to take another."

I will only add
VERU, SAP. SAT.

MAGNA CHARTA.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Enquiry is sometimes made, what has *Magna Charta* to do with the Church? Did such enquirers ever read the great Charter?

Clause 1 guarantees "That the Church of England shall be free and enjoy her whole rights and privileges inviolable, naming specially 'freedom of elections,' which is reckoned not necessary for the Church of England."

Clause 78 begins, "Wherefore we will and firmly enjoin that the Church of England be free," &c.

Clause 79 runs thus—"It is also sworn as well on our part as on the part of the barons, that all things aforesaid shall faithfully and sincerely be observed."

King John, we are told, was not a very estimable individual, but his barons "made him believe" (thus far, Baron Penzance, and a few other Victorian Barons might be better employed than they are if they would be better remembered.

RUNNYMEDE.

EPISCOPAL.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.)

Sirs,—Some time ago a correspondent, "Hoboken," wrote in your columns of the pity he had for those of the *Church of England* who were not content with their own legal definition, but went out of their way to borrow from his country the title Episcopal.

At the time I was glad to see the letter and have remembered it, and now write to give you an extract from a letter in the *English Guardian*, signed John A. Greaves, Ivy Depot, Virginia, written with reference to the Bishop of Long Island's recent address in England. Mr. Greaves says:—

"The second point in Bishop Littlejohn's address is that 'thousands who emigrate to America are ignorant that there is in their new country the same Church, the same priesthood, the same sacraments, the same worship that had been known at home by their fathers and by themselves.'"

It is a sad fact (he continues), and Bishop Littlejohn deserves our best thanks for calling attention to it, and I hope the clergy may lay it well to heart. But here again the Church in America is not wholly free from blame either. "Neither Romanism nor Dissent has been chargeable with such an oversight," says the Bishop. No; but they have not changed their name (the italics are those of Mr. Greaves). The Roman Catholics and Methodists and Baptists find their churches by their old familiar name, but not so in our case. The illiterate English labourer or servant-maid would hardly at first recognize the Church of their Fathers under the novel and circuitous name of "Protestant Episcopal," whilst almost every service in the Prayer Book has alterations, of a minor character it is true, but enough to make the uneducated (J. A. G.) doubt whether it is not a similar church rather than the same. In a colonizing age this change of name is a misfortune where the churches are so absolutely one; but it was America and not England made the changes. The Methodists, too (C. of E. M.) they call themselves "Methodist Episcopal Church." "*Semper ubique et ab omnibus*" is well applied to the Church's name as well as to her faith."

Your readers may not have heard a story very current in the United States of a newly-arrived emigrant seeking the Church, which he was told was called *Episcopal* there. He enquired at a log hut if there were any *Episcopalians* in that part of the country. "No not as I knows on" was the answer; "but," added the old woman, "step in—here's a curious animal our Jim shot to-day, may be it's what ye're seeking." The emigrant stayed the night, and prayers were said out of the *Book of Common Prayer* of the Church of England. The good old woman had not been out long herself and never heard the (to her at least) new-fangled name.

A CHURCH OF ENGLAND MAN.