

political and religious, are being laid at our feet. Confessedly, no better answer to the enquiry, how we shall best attain to our highest privilege, walk as sons of God in the full joy of our father's home, has been given to stand the test of life than this, "Work the works of God, by believing on Him whom He hath sent." Philosophy, wealth, genius, kingdoms can rise no higher, nor purchase more; the humblest in this world of discipline may rejoice therein without money and without price. Who would live the devil's child when the spirit of adoption may approach confidently the eternal with Abba! Father! and the talisman is this: "Believe on Him whom God hath sent."

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN.

"There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female, for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus."—*St. Paul.*

In the brief paper already published in THE CANADIAN INDEPENDENT, to which "Rejoinder" replies in last month's issue, the object was not so much to argue the main question as to secure, if possible, fair discussion without condescension, conventional apology, or flourish of "chivalric" trumpets, or any other kind of flourish whatever. To seriously begin to argue the matter before having heard from the other side never once presented itself to the mind of the writer.

It might simplify matters if "Rejoinder" would say by what "court" he would like his case to be tried, as "*tradition*," "*the Church*," and the *New Testament* are all mentioned.

We are told that the admission of women to "the ranks of the Christian ministry is thoroughly at variance with the traditionary practice and practical consensus of the orthodox churches," all of which might be conceded without much damage to my argument. Martin Luther found himself a good deal at "variance with the traditionary practice and practical consenses of the orthodox churches" of his day; and it was a fortunate circumstance for us that he was blessed with strength and wisdom to stand against "the practical consensus and traditionary practice of a church that has been able to boast till this hour that she is orthodox, and that she is unchanged."

That the question of woman's ministry

must be decided by the New Testament is not news to any one, in as much, I suppose, that all questions touching the church must be decided in the light of the New Testament; still "Rejoinder" should not forget that the church is not quite in harmony in respect to the interpreting of the New Testament, and it is great simplicity to hurl the New Testament at us "in the rough," as though the mention of the book decided the whole matter. "Rejoinder" tells us that "the gospel is not text-bound." We never thought it was text-bound; but we fear that a great many who believe the "gospel" are hide-bound, and hide-bound are likely to remain.

Had "Rejoinder" read my paper a little more carefully, he would have discovered that my argument was about the reverse of what he states it to be. I certainly never argued that because women are doctors, therefore they ought to be ministers, no more than I would argue that because a man is a minister of Jesus Christ, therefore he ought to be forthwith made Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada.

I spoke of women who had received "the essential qualifications" for the gospel ministry. Will "Rejoinder" undertake to show that women have not received these gifts?

The church has too often left secular society to fight the battle of liberty and progress. In view of the higher education of women, let it not be exemplified that "the children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light."

"Rejoinder" has told us that women have an accredited New Testament status in the church, and Romans xvi. 1 is cited: "Phebe, a minister of the church." How many churches "of the Congregational" order have women in office, and if women are not officers of the church to-day, what does appealing to the New Testament amount to? The Church of England, with a woman as visible Head of the Church and "Defender of the Faith," has at last taken steps to *revive* the office of deaconess. Yet "Rejoinder" speaks of the matter in the Congregational Church as an innovation. We are not inovators, but resuscitators of forgotten instrumentalities.

The Bishop of Durham, Dr. Lightfoot, in his first triennial charge to the clergy of his diocese in Durham Cathedral, said: "It has always been a matter of regret to me that in