

say of what—influence. But to my mind the note of the “Venerated Founder” of the Methodists reeks with most presumptuous blasphemy. If he believed that the words of St. Paul, the direction as given by him, were inspired, then they were spoken by the Holy Ghost. Thus the Spirit saith by the Apostle, “Let your women keep silence in the Churches,” which is an unqualified command of the Spirit; but Wesley adds, “Unless they are under an extraordinary impulse of the Spirit.” John Wesley thus presumptuously qualifies the teaching of the Spirit. Had such a qualification been the mind of the Spirit, I humbly think the Spirit would have made the same known at the time the command was given, and would not have left it for John Wesley to reveal it. Also, it must have been considered absolute and unqualified till Wesley’s “note” was written!

But, again, this “note” implies that there must be a judge as to whether any such women who violate the command “are under an extraordinary impulse of the Spirit.” If they are to be the judges themselves, we know how the judgment will be given, naturally in their favour. But if this be considered *too biassed* a judgment, then, either the case must be judged by the words of the speaker said to be spoken “under the influence” or by a particular description of the feelings under the impulse. Yet in these cases another must be found to judge. I do not think the “note” makes the passage more practical, if more plain.

The use of the passage from our point of view would be *ad hominem*. We do not consider their meeting houses as in any sense “churches,” and would not apply the command to such buildings, but inasmuch as they do call them “churches,” contrary to the teaching of their “Venerable Founder,” we have a just right to quote the passage against their practice.

I would like to refer to one other “note” of Wesley’s, the one added to Acts viii, 14, “And the Apostles who were at Jerusalem hearing that Samaria had received the Word of God, sent to them Peter and John.” To this Wesley adds, “Sent Peter and John. He that sends must be either superior, or at least equal, to him that is sent. It follows that the College of the Apostles was equal, if not superior, to Peter.” Quite so. The argument and the conclusion are good. But it tells as much against the principles and practice of the Methodists as it was against the doctrine of the Romanists. For under this theory even if John Wesley ordained Coke to be anything, he could only, at the most ordain him to be the equal of himself. And as John Wesley was only a Presbyterian or Priest, he could not make Coke a Bishop. Quite so. Then by Wesley’s own teaching Coke could not be a Bishop. And, again, as Coke was at the time of such ordination the equal of Wesley, being also a Presbyterian or Priest, it is hard to know what either expected as the result of that so-called ordination. To consider it any such is to make them both appear *senile*.

We offer our Methodists a very possible and flattering solution of the incident, viz., that, being such devoted friends, the one—the younger Priest—craved and received the Blessing of his elder brother, with the imposition of hands, before going out to take up the work the other had resigned.

Yours truly,

JOHN LOCKWARD.

Port Medway, N.S., Dec. 9th, 1893.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—I have watched with some interest the correspondence going on for some time in our Church papers in reply to “Country Parson” “as to the practice of the Clergy of the Church taking part in religious services with other denominations.” My attention has been particularly called to the reported opening services

of a church at Hespeler in the Diocese of Huron, at which the Bishop of the Diocese was present, and that within the Communion rails were Ministers of the Methodist and Presbyterian bodies. I can hardly suppose such could have been correct and have looked for some refutation of the statement, not believing it possible that the Bishop of the Diocese and the Rector of the Parish could have knowingly been consenting parties to such a violation of the Canon of the Diocese on this question. It would appear as of little use to enact Canons, that our Bishops and Clergy bind themselves to obey, if they are thus to be so flagrantly ignored for the pandering to those who are in dissent from us, and have at heart no sympathy with us, and do not hesitate to traduce us. Christian Unity, so much talked about in the present day, will never come about by such means, as if we are to gain the respect of others we must first respect ourselves, and at least be consistent.

Mr. Editor, I am only a layman, but I can easily understand the difficulties of the poor “Country Parson,” who is trying to educate his people to believe in their Church that has stood the test of 1800 years, and is a true Branch of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, in whose prayers we vainly ask to be delivered from all *Heresy and Schism* if we are thus to be led to fraternize with those causing such. And that by those who have the rule over us!

We hear so much from some of the danger of High Churchism and Ritualism; but surely there must be danger also in No Churchism, which is leading us to Methodism.

At the last meeting of the Huron Synod a Committee was appointed to “investigate the various causes which hinder the growth of the Church of England in this Diocese, &c., &c.”

From the foregoing I should imagine that this Committee would not have much difficulty in arriving at least at one of the causes retarding the progress of the Church in Huron, as also the cause of the great deficiency reported in the Maintenance and Mission Funds.

For to insure progress in the Church and a liberal support of her funds, we must be taught to believe in her superiority over all man made churches, both by example and precepts of those who minister to us in Holy things.

Nothing can be gained for any cause by a half-hearted belief and faith in it. We are either Churchmen, or we are not; there can be no doubting or half and half measures if we desire and intend to uphold the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church. Yours truly,

CHURCHMAN.

Dec. 12th, 1893.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

To the Editor of the CHURCH GUARDIAN:

SIR,—“Candid Friend’s” letter in your issue of 6th inst., confirms the statement made by me at the Yarmouth Missionary Conference, that Prince Edward Island is not part of the Diocese of Nova Scotia.

Can any of your readers give us further information on this subject? We know what we are not. Now we would like to know what we are.

I stated in my paper, that the first Bishop of Nova Scotia was given jurisdiction over the Province of P. E. Island, and this I did upon authority I thought was perfectly reliable, but without examining the letters patent of Bishop Inglis. But the Rev. H. C. Stuart in his recently published work, “The Church of England in Canada, 1759–1793,” quotes these letters, however, as follows: [page 62]

George the III., to Chas. Inglis, Bishop of Nova Scotia: “Whereas, our Provinces of Quebec, New Brunswick and Newfoundland are not yet divided or formed into dioceses as Bishop’s

Sees, . . . know that we . . . by those presents do give and grant unto you the aforesaid Bishop of Nova Scotia, power and authority to exercise jurisdiction, spiritual and ecclesiastical in the aforesaid provinces, etc.”

It will be seen that P. E. Island is not mentioned, and [if the quotation is correct] the first Bishop of Nova Scotia had no jurisdiction over this Island, which had been a separate province for seventeen years when he was consecrated.

But further, in the Statutes of P. E. Island, there was an Act passed in xliii. year of George III., “for the better and more effectual establishment of the Church of England in this Island, which states, . . . and that for the preservation of unity and purity of doctrine and discipline in the Church, and the right administration of Sacrament, no minister shall be admitted to officiate as a minister of the Church of England, but such as shall produce to the Governor, Lieut-Governor, or Commander-in-Chief for the time being, a testimonial that he hath been duly licensed by the Bishop of London or by the Bishop of Nova Scotia. So although Bishop Inglis was consecrated in 1787, in 1803 the Bishop of London had equal or superior authority to him in this Province.

This Act was repealed in xlii. year of Victoria and the following was substituted.

. . . No person shall officiate as a minister of the Church of England in this province, except he be duly licensed by the Bishop for the time being, exercising Episcopal jurisdiction over the Church of England in this Island.”

Still, it will be seen the Bishop of Nova Scotia is not mentioned by name, and it was only some four years ago that a special Act was passed making His Lordship a corporation sole in this province.

The following questions arise:

1. If the first Bishop of Nova Scotia had no jurisdiction over P. E. Island, is there anything to show that this jurisdiction was conferred upon his successors?

2. Why was the Bishop of Nova Scotia’s name coupled with the Bishop of London in the Act above quoted if such jurisdiction had been conferred.

3. If, as “Candid Friend” says: the present Bishop of Nova Scotia was elected by the Synod of Nova Scotia to the Diocese of Nova Scotia, and no mention was made of the jurisdiction of P. E. Island, can one legally execute such jurisdiction?

Can the clergy and laity of P. E. Island, if they belong to no diocese, lawfully sit in the General or the Provincial Synod?

I hope some of our historical friends will be able to throw a little light upon these questions, in order that we in P. E. Island may know our Ecclesiastical position more clearly than at present. Yours faithfully,

JAMES SIMPSON,

Priest, Incumbent of St. Peters.

It is the religious duty of every man to be true to every part of the nature God has given him. I believe that the purpose of religion is to build up the whole man in the love and practice of whatever is true, whatever is honourable, whatever is lovely, whatever is of good repute; if there be any virtue or any praise, to make him eager for its attainment; to lead him to strive to be such that men, beholding him, shall have some faint idea what God had in mind when He placed the unfallen Adam in the garden, lord of himself and all the lower creation. —G. W. Field, D.D.

The essence of all saving Christian Faith lies in the belief in God as revealed to us in Christ by His Spirit; the essence of all Christian conduct lies in the fearless final acceptance of God’s commandments as the supreme guide of our life.—Farrar.