

a number of suggestions. I have come to the conclusion that the army system—that presented in my resolution—is the only plan feasible at the present,—to open our schools at certain hours to the ministers of all religious denominations.

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 CHURCH AND THE SACRAMENTS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—Thanks to "Another Layman" and "A Missionary" for courteous remarks on my letter. The thought pervading the comments of the first appear to be that Sacraments, the Church, &c., should be sermon topics because of their importance as the means of coming to Christ. He says, "Christ has appointed the way and means by which we have access unto Him, which make us 'to dwell in Him and He in us.' The means are the Sacraments."

This view, held conscientiously, demands my respect, yet I am not able to hold it as here expressed. We have access by prayer, repentance, faith. Heb. iv. 16; Eph. iii. 2; Acts iii. 19; Heb. xi. 6; John vi. 29; John v. 1; John vi. 47. I think repentance and faith are both conditions precedent to the reception of the Sacraments, and that we come to Christ by the acts, of which the Sacraments are the signs. The Sacraments are "badges," "tokens," "witnesses," "signs," of our Christian state. They cannot stand in the place of the thing they represent. The sign cannot be as important as the thing signified. When our Lord declares, with his emphatic "verily, verily," the condition or means of receiving everlasting life, to be faith in Him,— "He that believeth in Me hath everlasting life."

I dare not believe that Sacraments,— which are outward and visible signs of a state of grace which necessarily precedes them,—are the means. Do we not more Scripturally estimate the Sacraments when we say they are the means of "strengthening and refreshing" our souls after we have been made alive through faith?

The Sacraments, so far from being the means whereby we obtain the grace of faith, stand in reverse relation—faith being the means whereby we receive the Sacraments. "The means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." Article XXVIII.

"Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you." These are Christ's words. I stand reverently in their presence; but I need not inform your correspondent that their reference to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is a controverted point. The Saviour Himself appears to set aside the idea of a material act of eating being meant, when he said: "The flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I speak unto you are spirit and are life." Our Lord as pointedly speaks of "living water," "a well of water springing up into everlasting life," yet a spiritual reception of his doctrine was the thing meant, not a physical fountain of water.

Touching the relative importance of the Sacraments and the preaching of the Gospel, we may gather a thought from the Apostle to the Gentiles: "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel." "I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." "We preach Christ crucified." The Scriptures warrant us in esteeming the preaching of the Gospel important. "Go preach," said by word and example, our Divine Lord. We do not expect men to be "satisfied with preaching," yet through the preaching of "the everlasting Gospel" the knowledge of redemption is brought to man, and the souls redeemed by the Blood of the Lamb will "be satisfied when they awake in His likeness."

I desire not to be misunderstood. I would not set in antagonism Christ and the Sacraments. But seeing that faith is first and chiefest, I would desire that the "proportion of faith" be recognized. Is there need for largely dwelling upon the Church, the Sacraments, and outward things? We are all baptized, all bring our children to the Font, all come to the Holy Table, or all, at least, whom faith

and love draw thither, and no others should come. We hold our Church dear, we honor her Ministry, support her by our offerings, and have done this, (the writer and many who are in accord with him), through a lifetime of unswerving loyalty to her fold. To bring in the indifferent, the wayward, needs the preaching of "the unsearchable riches of Christ." Tell of Jesus as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and men will flock to His Church and to His Scriptural Sacraments. Forbear to tell that Christ, the Lord of all, is tied and bound by ordinances, and can only save "on the Church's lines." Win souls to believe in Him, and they will readily fall into the line of obedience to all his commands.

For one soul stirred to seek him through the preaching of Sacrament, and Churchmanship, and outward rite, a multitude would become warmed to look to the flock of Ages through the recital of His infinite love.

Yours sincerely, LAYMAN.

P. S.—I note a correspondent refers to my letter in terms which he will regret on reconsideration. I gave no grounds for the charge that I sneered at the Sacraments; still less for the insinuation that "Layman" is a sceptic.

THE ROAD TO ROME.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—This is the heading of a Paragraph in a paper lately received from England of the anti-high Church stamp. A respectable clergyman had, it was said, gone over to Rome, the ladies who helped him in Parish work were going over in a body, secodors could be numbered by hundreds. In all this there was not a word of truth. In the next column—side by side with this piece of "false wishes"—was a mild mention, that a lady lately deceased "joined the Church of Rome in 1856" but then—she was the daughter of an ultra-evangelical Bishop and the sister of a Deax who would have been disciplined again and again, only that he is a Bishop unto himself. So much for animus!

Yours, JUSTICE.

THE CHURCH AGGRESSIVE.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., } Jan. 12th, 1880. }

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—The letter signed "Edward Wasell," in your issue of the 8th inst., so exactly hits the nail on the head, that I cannot help saying how much I sympathize with the writer.

We have had enough of negations, of nothingarianism, of passive Churchmanship. Let us go forward and be aggressive, just as every other denomination does and is. We have a defined faith, a defined mission, and should have a defined purpose.

Our laity could do much. Almost every Baptist makes it his mission to keep his principles well to the front, to push them even where they are not wanted, to fight for them. So I can say of other bodies. But many of our Church laity do not realize their mission at all as Churchmen, and some seem to be diligent on every advance but their own.

The clergy must witness to the faith with sharp, ringing tones, which by their very force say, "No surrender?" In time men will see that we are whole-hearted, and will give us help. In the meantime we must expect the half-hearted and the careless to misunderstand and to misrepresent us. A sneer and a jibe now and then will do us good. Are we to be greater than our Master?

I am, SIRS, Yours faithfully, ALFRED OSBORNE.

ORNAMENTS RUBRIC.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—I have been trying to read and to learn from the several letters which have appeared in your paper in reference to the Ornaments Rubric and the Advertisements of Queen Elizabeth. I am now of opinion that neither "Historical Student" nor "A Conservative Churchman" have read the last, or many of the latest arguments in connection with these subjects. Of course if "Conservative Churchman" accepts the Privy Council as an infallible authority, or even any authority at all, on the subject he will believe their judgment till they are pleased to take all their mighty deliverances back. I am not, however, going to enter the lists

with your other correspondents, or join issue with them, but I would like to say to any of your readers interested in the subject that they will find a clear treatment of it in "A History of the Church of England," by G. G. Perry and on p. p., 289—300, also p. 501 note (b). Yours concernedly,

LAMBDA. [This discussion must now close.—Eds.]

TEMPERANCE.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—I gladly send you the remarks of Archdeacon Perowne at the Norwich Diocesan Conference on the subject of the formation of a Diocesan Church of England Temperance Society, as reported in Church Bells of Nov. 22nd p. 622.

"Archdeacon Perowne pointed out that the discussion, interesting as it had been, had traveled out of the question before the Conference, which was not as to whether drunkenness was an evil, they all admitted that—nor whether in the judgment of those who had tried it the Church of England Temperance Society was a successful institution, but whether the movement had so taken hold of the mind, the judgment, the opinion, the sentiment, of the diocese, as to make it desirable that this particular Society should claim the mark of a Diocesan Society with the Bishops for its President. Now, he ventured to say, that there certainly existed in the Diocese a very large and wide sentiment, that whereas men shrank with all their hearts from seeming to hinder anything that was attacking a great natural evil, they were not convinced with regard to the methods adopted by this Society. What they needed was, proof that this particular method, of dealing with drunkenness—he preferred, to say drunkenness, it was incorrect to speak of temperance, as it was with drunkenness and the drunken habits of the people they had to deal—they needed proof that this particular method of dealing with the evil was the best. They would do harm if they out-ran the real feeling of the diocese, as they would very much add to the painfulness and difficulty of the position of those who felt they could not heartily join in the movement, and as unless it was a thoroughly diocesan movement, it would suffer from having a prominence given to it which was beyond its real hold upon the Church in the diocese."

I heartily commend these remarks to the most serious consideration of the irrepressible supporters of the proposal for the formation of a Diocesan Church of England Temperance in this Diocese of Fredericton.

Yours very temperately, LAMBDA. January, 12th 1880.

FREE CHURCHES.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—I believe "Free and Open" had a better motive in sending you the cutting from the Record than the editor of that paper had in its first publication. After 40 years experience of that paper, I take up anything from it with the same sort of feeling that an Orangeman has when he touches a Tablet.

The question is simply, Is a Church God's House or not? If it be, all God's children have equal right in it, and there is no room for pride. That keen wit, Jerrold, once described London pride in words like these: "The biggest house in the Square, and the biggest pew in the Church."

I presume the same sort of pride may exist in Hull or Halifax. We know it was pride that first peopled another place beginning with H. But I can't see why a church endowed with \$1,000 a year can be said to have failed in the free and open seat arrangement because the offertories were not satisfactory! The remedy was worse than the disease. Why not have gone to each of the regular attendants and said, "Now we want \$250 a year for expenses. How much will you give?" The answer would be, "A Dollar," or "Two Dollars," or more. The canvasser would make a note of the promise, and present the promiser with a small envelope with his initials or name on it, saying, "Be kind enough to put your contribution in that, and offer it at some service, and I will tick you off as paid." More money might have been got and God's House left free to all His children. While writing, I will relate an anecdote I came across the other day of a Judge, (I fear not a just one), who advised a Church-

warden not to use bags for collecting the alms and offerings. "Why," asked the latter. "Well, I will tell you," was the reply. "When I go to a strange church, I put sixpence in one pocket and a sovereign in the other. If a plate comes round it costs me a pound, but if a bag I get off for sixpence."

And yet another:—"Are there many wealthy people in this congregation," asked a stranger of a sexton. "Oh, yes, wealth indeed, leastways, but few put in more than 10 cents of a Sunday, so I guess their rich."

"Will a man rob God?" "Wherein have we robbed Thee?" God's answer is to be found in Malachi iii. 8, 9.

FREE AND OPEN.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—Permit me to send you the following from the Church Bells:

"The mischievous letters which recently appeared in the Times from Mr. Madland, Vicar of St. Martin's, Kentish Town, have been followed up by articles antagonistic to the offertory system. In reply to one of these articles in the Record, Canon Scott, Vicar of St. Mary's, Hull, writes to that paper:—"I cannot help expressing a wish that before you made so much of the "collapse at Hull" of the free and open church system, you had inquired of some who know whether things were any better at the above church, (i.e., St. Matthew's), under the old system during the few years after its consecration, when it was not free and open. Experience teaches me that the free and open system is never a failure from any inherent weakness in the system, very seldom from the selfishness of the congregation, both which you seem to suggest in your article."

This from the Vicar of the Mother Church in Hull speaks volumes.

Yours, FOR ALL PEOPLE.

RECENT LARGE ACCESSIONS.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—I have noticed with very great pleasure your Editorial, in a late number of your valuable paper, under the above caption. You rightly say that such a list must necessarily be found incomplete, and that very many accessions are never heard of. Since there is no way of obtaining a complete list, I have myself for some time recorded the names of those coming to us from the Ministry of other bodies, and I find my list contains several which are not found in yours. You will perhaps deem this news worthy of a place in your paper, especially when I give you the list. I may state that it appears to me one or two errors have crept into your recent article.

The Mr. G. Bradley, whose name you publish, is, I believe, the same as the Leverett Bradley from the same city, (Boston, Mass.), whose name you recorded in Church Work last year. No. 27, (Mr. Cowan), whom you represent as being a Presbyterian, is the same who afterwards joined the Reformed Episcopal, and who came from them to us. His accession was also reported in December, 1878. Nos. 43 and 49 are certainly the same person. Kirk and Keith have, I noticed, occurred in various periodicals at the same time, but Kirk was the name originally given.

This brings down your list for last year to 46. Suffer me to add a few additional names:—

- 47. Mr. M. Edmunds, Methodist Minister, Eastwood, Canada.
48. Mr. J. J. McNulty, Presbyterian do., Bishop of Connecticut.
49. Mr. C. Howard Malcolm, D. D., Baptist do., Newport, Conn. (Confirmed).
50. Rev. C. M. W. Hills, Roman Catholic Priest, Cincinnati, S. Ohio.
51. Mr. F. C. J. Bosanquet, Unitarian Minister England.
52. Mr. Edward Augustus Rand, Congregational do., Bishop of Massachusetts.
53. Dr. David, Presbyterian do., Lawrence, Mass.
54. Mr. Isaac M. Froy, Congregational do., Sterling, Kansas.

There were also many others confirmed and some ordained which I have noticed, whose names do not appear. For example, Bishop Holly, Haiti, reports having received into the Church four entire Anabaptist congregations—preachers and all. The wife of Dr. Malcolm and two children were confirmed together with himself. The Bishop of Mississippi reports three as ordained in February last without giving names, and all of whom came from the denominations. A whole denomination, minister and laity, known

as the Zion Union Apostolic Church, have been received by Bishop Whittle, of Virginia.

And scarcely a confirmation occurs in any active parish in our land where members of some one or other of the denominations do not receive the Scriptural and Apostolic rite of "laying on of hands"—thus connecting themselves with Christ's mystical body—the Church.

God speed this grand work till all the scattered members of that same Body, "by schisms rent asunder, by heresies distrest"—are joined together in the unity of the Spirit in one communion and fellowship, and thus be enabled to do battle successfully with unbelief, and wickedness, and sin. "That they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that Thou has sent Me."

Faithfully yours, W. C. BRADSHAW.

Peterborough, Jan. 14, 1880.

THE PELICAN.

(To the Editors of the Church Guardian.) SIRS,—Is "The Pelican Feeding her Young" an emblem of the Resurrection? "The Pelican in her Piety" has always been understood to symbolize "Him who shed His own blood for us, and feeds us." Yours obediently, QUERIST.

OUR ENGLISH LETTER.

COLCHESTER, ENGLAND, December 23, '79.

Possibly the readers of the GUARDIAN may be interested in some random notes of a visit to Liverpool, Chester, and Colchester. The former is par excellence a modern town; the two latter are, like old '79, grey and hoary with age. I visited the chief objects of interest in Liverpool viz: St. George's Hall, the Walker Art Gallery, Brown's Free Public Library and Museum, &c., and was well rewarded for my trouble.

St. George's Hall is, I am told, the finest building of the kind in the kingdom. It certainly is beautiful within, and strikingly majestic without. The Walker Gallery contains some very good paintings, chiefly by modern artists, Brown's Library and Museum though much inferior to that wonderful collection of curiosities—the British Museum, yet contains enough that is interesting, to detain a visitor several hours at least. The Churches in Liverpool are chiefly modern. There is one however, dedicated to St. Nicholas, called the "Old Church," which dates back to the 11th century. I attended it on Sunday morning, and was much pleased with its appearance. The service was choral throughout, and the singing very good—the Te Deum (new to me) being a very fine selection.

From Liverpool to Chester is about an hour's journey by rail. That old cathedral city is perfectly delightful. I doubt if I shall find any place in England to please me more. The curious "rows," the venerable wall around the town, (the top of which is a charming place for a stroll), the grand Cathedral, and many other things, make Chester most interesting to the tourist. I was at Evesonsg in the Cathedral, and had the pleasure of seeing Dean Howson. In the vestry the vergor showed me a stone found in the city wall, which bears date A. D. 25. Quite a piece of antiquity.

From Liverpool to Colchester is a tiresome journey of some eight hours. The latter is an old Roman town, with many narrow little streets and lanes, which a carriage passes through only with great care. Colchester has some beautiful ivy-grown ruins—Norman, Saxon, and Roman remains. It is a garrison town, and walking down High street (decidedly modern), one might readily imagine himself in Halifax, except for the cry of "nice fresh sprats, eh!"

The weather is very cold for England, and foggy. There has been good skating, and the demand for Starr's "Aome" far exceeds the supply. "Merry Christmas," Messrs. Editors, and au revoir. ARVIA.