

is no longer tolerated in the district of Utah; it is also true that not many years ago it was reigning triumphant and unchecked. And I believe it is no less true that, whilst it lasted, Mormons could boast of a higher morality than obtained in most European or American cities. The social evil which is our scourge and reproach was unknown amongst them. It may be added that the Government was firmly and fairly administered, and that the prosperity and contentment of the people afforded no opportunity to the enemies of Polygamy to blaspheme. It may also be said that there are thousands still convinced that it was right, and longing for its restoration.

Let us suppose, then, that Mr. Price Hughes or Dr. Beet had offered to Brigham Young the defence of Methodism which they have recently offered to us. Suppose they had said in his presence what they have said elsewhere, "You must not appeal to the Bible. That was written two thousand years ago. God recognizes facts, and the sooner we do the same the better for everybody concerned." I can imagine his reply. I apprehend he would have said effusively, "I am delighted to hear for once such robust common-sense. That is just what we say, and all ways have said. We, too, appeal to facts, and here they are in Salt Lake City. *Si monumentum queris, circumspice.*" Perhaps Mr. Hughes and Dr. Beet will tell us what their reply would have been. That is not quite so easy to conjecture. The Mormon (and possibly others) firmly believes his facts to be every bit as good as the Methodist facts. I do not say that they are—very far from it. All I say is that the Methodist argument cuts two ways, and leads to conclusions for which they are entirely unprepared. I have no idea of putting Methodism and Mormonism on the same level—those who appeal to facts do that—but I should be glad to know why, if Methodism may appeal to the fact of its existence in proof of its lawfulness—for this is what it really comes to—Mormonism may not do the same.

I say "to the fact of its existence," for I do not see what other fact Methodism can appeal to. It cannot appeal to its original principles or first beginnings, for it cannot pretend that it is in harmony with the intentions of its founders. Nor can it appeal to the good work which it has since done, for that was accomplished not by Methodism, but by Christianity; nor to its numbers, for the truth is not to be settled by counting noses; nor to its history, for that has been a series of secessions. It can only appeal to its existence.

But I may perhaps be accused of only giving one half of the argument used by the Polychurchists. I may be reminded that they protest against an exclusive appeal to the inspired writings on the ground that an inspiration has been granted to the representatives of the sects. Let us suppose, therefore, that, in putting their case before the Mormon leader, they had reinforced the appeal to facts by the claim of inspiration. I can fancy his transports of delight. "Why, that," he would say, "is just where we stand. Give me your hand. We are in thorough accord. You have your inspiration: we have had our revelation. In the book of Mormon, you will see proofs of the inspiration which has led to the revival of Polygamy." Again, I repeat, I do not for one moment compare the character, or motives, or "inspiration" granted to the representatives of the Methodists and other sects with those of Joseph Smith; but what I do say is that they are now using weapons which have been used before in the Far West, and they are also supplying weapons to others who may hereafter rise up and use them to support the most vicious or preposterous pretensions. We should, therefore, very much like to know what Dr. Duff and those who think with him would have answered in such a case. It will be very good of them if they will tell us; we shall, for the truth's sake, be sincerely grateful to them. For myself, I can only imagine either that they would fall back on the Bible—in spite of its having been "written so long ago"—or that they would take their stand on considerations of morality and decency. But in either case I think they would be tempted to say, "O, come, we have had enough of these 'facts of modern Christendom,' if Polygamy is to be one of them."

Let us suppose, then, in the first place, that they did after all make an appeal to Holy Scripture—we are all of us ready enough to do that when it suits our turn. Let us suppose them to say to the astute Mormon President, "The Church is one thing; marriage is quite another. Polychurchism is not to be settled by 'the old book of God,' but Polygamy is. We object *in toto* to your 'peculiar institution,' because it is distinctly immoral, and therefore it is against the revealed will of God." He might have replied—I do not know that he would have done so—"You speak of the revealed will of God: it is to Scripture that you now refer me. Then I will engage to show that this volume has much more to say against Polychurchism than against Polygamy: that Polygamy, indeed, is quite respectable by the side of Polychurchism." And then he might have reminded Mr. Hughes that the two institutions, marriage and the Church, are not so very different in God's sight

seeing that God Himself "has consecrated the state of matrimony to such an excellent mystery that in it is signified and represented the spiritual marriage and unity betwixt Christ and His Church" (Eph. v.). He might have enlarged in the next place on the extreme antiquity of polygamy (Gen. v. 19), whilst Polychurchism, as history shows, is a purely modern conception. He might claim for the former at least the sanction of the Almighty. The Mormon could remind the Methodist that both Abraham, the friend of God, and David, the man after God's own heart, upheld this institution in their own persons, and are never condemned for it. The Wesleyans often point to their saints as proofs that their system has God's approval. The Mormon can do more. He cannot only point to the "Father of the faithful" and the "sweet Psalmist of Israel" as witnesses on his side, but he can do what the Dissenter cannot do. He can cite Scriptures which prove that Polygamy has had, for whatever reasons, the Divine sanction—such, for example, as Deut. xxi. 17, and 2 Chron. xxiv. 23. And if the Dissenter replies, as he has replied, that at any rate separation is nowhere condemned, the Mormon might answer, first, that it was condemned in the case and person of Jeroboam (1 Kings xii. 26-33), and that too, at the very time when Polygamy was permitted and practiced on its largest scale (ch. xi. 3; 2 Chr. xi. 23). He might further observe that schism and *dichostasia* were emphatically denounced by St. Paul, and he might ask how there can possibly be Polychurchism without a dichostasia, or standing apart. But that is not all. He might once more take the Methodist argument out of his mouth, and use it effectively for the justification of Mormonism. "You say (he might reply) that Polychurchism is permissible because, though it is nowhere sanctioned, it is nowhere expressly condemned. I thank thee for that word." Polygamy occupies a still stronger position. It is nowhere forbidden, and, in addition to this, in some places it is sanctioned. And if the Dissenter in an unguarded moment asks, "What about our Lord's words in St. Matthew xix. 4-6, and what about 1 Tim. iii. 2—'the husband of one wife'?" I can imagine how the Polygamist would turn upon him and rend him. "You," he would say, "of all per ones, to cite these words! You, who find our Lord distinctly recognizing one Church and no more, and that one His, in St. Matt. xvi. 18, and who yet insist on separate and sectarian 'churches'; you, to point me to ch. xix., and say that He distinctly recognizes one wife and no more! But if you may still have more churches than one, why may not we have more wives than one?—And as to 1 Tim., you find 'one body' mentioned by the same Apostle who speaks of the 'one wife,' and yet you contend that this is quite compatible with two hundred bodies—just because the Bible was written so long ago, and our circumstances have so greatly changed! So that you make no difficulty in altering the essentials—for the very place which the 'one body' occupies, side by side with the 'one Spirit' and 'one Lord' (Ephes. iv. 4) shows that it is an essential; yet you blame us for altering a mere item, an accidental! You say yourself, too, that times have changed. But if they have changed for you, have they not also changed for us? Sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. Besides, what you are doing is to overthrow the Scripture; what we are doing is to expound it. 'One body,' standing where it does, cannot mean more than one body, but 'one wife' may mean (as we say it does) 'one wife at least.' " "Besides," he might add, "St. Paul is speaking of presbyters and deacons, and of these only. He is not laying down a law for laymen; and even if he were—well, you have yourself reminded us that we need not trouble ourselves on that score. You have as good as told us that they 'didn't know everything down in Judea'—that is what your contention comes to. You have yourself affirmed that 'we have to deal to day with a totally different situation, a situation which St. Paul never discussed, because he never foresaw it.' (Review of the Churches, p. 376), so that you have yourself showed us, by the way you deal with the 'one body' difficulty—and that is only one out of many—how we may treat the 'one wife' difficulty." "No," he might proceed to say, "denunciations of Polygamy come with a particularly bad grace from the advocates of Polychurchism. Every argument that you use to justify your position is a triumphant vindication of our institutions. Every argument urged against us applies with still greater force to you. You cannot in the same breath excuse Polychurchism and assail Polygamy. Your defence of Methodism has showed us how to defend Mormonism."

Nor am I sure that the Polychurchist would do much better, if, instead of making any appeal to Scripture, he spoke exclusively of decency and propriety. For the Mormon would have his answer ready. He would, or he might say—"I must ask you to observe that, whilst reproaching us with Polygamy, you do not scruple to charge it upon your Lord. I can well believe that you do not intend to do anything of the kind, but you do it all the same,

as I will now prove to you. You admit that Christ's relation to the Church is expressly likened in Holy Writ to that of the husband to the wife. As the husband is the head of the wife, so is Christ the head of the Church (Eph. v. 23). As the husband and wife again are one flesh, so do Christ and the Church form one body (v. 29, 30), and you will observe that St. Paul is here speaking of the *visible* Church, because in addition to other considerations, he says it has been 'cleansed by the laver of water with the word' (v. 26). The body he has in his mind is clearly the body of the baptized. Now, you affirm that instead of one great Catholic Church, there are many 'separate and independent Churches? But if so, then Christ is the Head and Husband of each and all. And what else is this but Polygamy? Yes, you who rail at our institutions, little as you may design so to do, make out that your sacred Lord is guilty of spiritual Polygamy."

It is with extreme reluctance that I write these words. I know that they cannot be acceptable to Mr. Hughes and the many Polychurchists for whom I cherish a profound respect. But truth comes first. If only I can induce them to reconsider the ground they have taken up, I shall not regret even the misrepresentations to which this argument may possibly expose me. I may perchance be represented as an apologist for Polygamy. Of course, I am nothing of the kind, but they are quite welcome to say that I am—I have experienced some such amenities—if only our Dissenting brethren will patiently consider that they cannot uphold Polychurchism—at any rate on the grounds which they have chosen to occupy—without at the same time opening the door to Polygamy and a hundred other heresies, which drown men in destruction and perdition.

Home & Foreign Church News

FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENTS.

NOVA SCOTIA.

BERWICK.—A new foundation has been put under the little church in this village, which has been otherwise also greatly improved. The last portion of the debt has been cleared off by the generous donation of \$35 from Mrs. Binney, the widow of the late Bishop of Nova Scotia. The old stove has happily been banished, and a furnace placed in the crypt which admirably heats the Church.

CORNWALLIS.—The parish guild proves an admirable instrument for doing good in various ways. A parlor concert was given in the rectory last month which passed off very successfully. The proceeds went towards paying off the debt on the rectory.

KENTVILLE.—At the anniversary meeting of the Church Workers' Association most of the officers of the past year were re-elected. Much regret is expressed at the retirement of Mrs. Frank Lynch, who from the association's inception has held office, giving most efficient aid to its success in purchasing of the materials, and in the cutting out and arrangement of the work. The secretary-treasurer submitted a statement showing a net profit (including value of work in hand) of \$143.31. A balance is now in hand of \$242.71. The association has a membership of 56, 12 of whom are honorary members, and 44 working members. The rector reported a donation of \$20 from Mrs. Binney, of Halifax.

The electric incandescent light has been introduced into the parish church with very gratifying results. The small towns of Nova Scotia appear to be quick to utilize this admirable and safe mode of lighting their churches. We can on the spur of the moment name no less than seven small places which have adopted it: Digby, Annapolis, Kentville, Wolfville, Truro, Springhill and Amherst, and probably several other places as well.

LOCKEPORT.—Rev. N. R. Raven, who has been in England for the past year or so, has returned to this diocese to take up the work in this parish vacated by the resignation of the Rev. T. W. Johnston.

WINDSOR.—On Monday evening, the 4th inst., the annual meeting of the Students' Missionary Society of King's College was held in Christ Church school house. There was a good attendance, especially good for such an unpleasant evening. The secretary, Mr. C. D. Schofield, read his report, which spoke of a very successful and encouraging year's work, and stated, among other pleasing features, that the money which had been promised towards the support of the student from Jerusalem had all been paid. The secretary's report was followed by an interesting address from Mr. C. S. Wilcox, who gave an account of the work done by St. Andrew's Brotherhood, showing how much practical assistance may be given to the clergyman and to the parish by this organization, which is really doing very effective missionary work in the home field.

Rev. K. C. Work to with Jacob K. now pur speaking shown h amongst some of cluding now bei last spee fax, one Missiona "The M Altoget and tho trouble Much c and pra On S Brown ministry preaching The C and K Christm Dr. F Provinc lastic in

Churc Lads' B bury, Y has bee and is p

Adven services in Queb Wednes evening Matthe

Confir held a s Quebec receive were co

* Pasto left Que 5th inst Friday, afterno Paul's (night w Saturd Perryb semble begun sermon Quite a fourths to car primiti mornin ing of miles, was re St. Cu was b numbe plain, dates l the sc fact th and H the Ch the es a crow were c what v at Di Lordsl servic mon (to a cl of the the go glory His L which the n dition able a missic

Mac of a Lawr at Gr and i