

body of Christ, till we all come, in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, that we be no more children tossed to and fro and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive, but speaking the truth in love, may grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head, even Christ."

This ministry has been continued (down to our own day) through an uninterrupted succession from (the time of) the Apostles till now. And it will continue (as long as the world lasts) in virtue of that promise made by our Lord Himself to His first ministers, "Lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world;" even as the Church itself (whose ministers they are) shall so continue (to the end); for He has founded it upon a rock, and has declared that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Do we want to know for certain what is our proper duty as Christian people with regard to the Church and her ministers? We need be in no doubt on this head. It has been providentially so ordered that Holy Scripture should record what was the conduct of the first Christian in this respect for our example and guidance. It is said of them that "they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in the breaking of bread and in the prayers." Here we see that the doctrine of the Apostles was then as it is now, the rule of faith for Christians, the communion of the Apostles their bond of fellowship—"they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship;" and in order to testify their union with Christ and with each other, they partook of the same Holy Communion and joined in the same common prayers—"they continued.....in the breaking of bread and in the prayers."

Let us not doubt that this account of the way in which the first Christians acted has been set down, under Divine inspiration, on purpose that it may afford evermore an example of the way in which we ourselves and all Christians should act until the end of the world.—*Irish Ecclesiastical Gazette.*

HERE AND THERE AND EVERYWHERE.

(CONTRIBUTED.)

There seems to be a marked drift in some Sunday schools in this Canada towards the adoption of the International system of lessons accommodated to the Great Festivals of the Church year. When will Church people believe that the Church of England has a backbone of its own enabling it to stand on its own feet and brains enough within it at least sufficient to make out a Sunday School Scheme and Helps for its own children? The unintentional danger of the International scheme lies in the vast literature connected with it, which as far as the Sacrament of Infant Baptism is concerned can never honestly and boldly teach it, for the literature is meant to be used in Baptist schools. Now the Church of England starts her teaching from infant Baptism and hence the foundation of Church of England teaching is ignored by the International literature—a fact sufficient to condemn Scheme, Helps, and Literature at once, forever, and finally. There are other objections to the scheme that might easily be noticed, but this is the root objection. Teachers like the scheme because of the literature: the literature practically drops the spiritual importance of infant baptism out of its teaching—hence such

literature should *not* form the food to be given to our children.

At the 5th annual conference of the Catholic Truth Society held lately in Liverpool, Archbishop Vaughan being present, the Rev. J. S. Vaughan mourned over the fact that out of 29,000,000 of people in England hardly one and a half million professed the Catholic (Roman) faith. He advocated a missionary crusade against non Catholics and High Church Anglicans, Evangelical Dissenters and non Christians, and did so in the presence of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Westminster and the Bishops of Liverpool and Salford unrebuked. And yet some of the American Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church shrink from supporting mission work in Mexico lest they should interfere with the Bishops of the Roman Church in that country.

Welsh Nonconformity demands disestablishment and disendowment and claims to be supreme in numerical majority over the Church, and in the affections of the people, and yet the Welsh Nonconformist congress representing all nonconformity in all parts of Wales has up to the present only 200 members.

The following are some of the subjects selected for discussion:—"The Laws relating to Burials and Marriages," "The Mission of Welsh Nonconformity at this time of National Awakening," "The Duty of Welsh Nonconformists in the face of moral and social problems that await solution," "The Difficulties of Welsh Nonconformists at the present time," "Ritualism and Popery," "The Position of Nonconformists in Politics," and "The Civil Establishment of religion with the light of Scripture."

The Rev. Dr. Pierson, an American Presbyterian, and the Rev. Thomas Spurgeon a strong Baptist are candidates for the pulpit and work of the late renowned Rev. C. J. Spurgeon. The congregation seem most unpleasantly divided over the merits of the candidates and the once magnificently united congregation is all in a tangle. Dr. Clifford, the great leading Baptist clergyman, proposes to elect Dr. James Spurgeon, Dean of the Tabernacle, and Dr. Pierson and Mr. Thos. Spurgeon as preaching canons. He claims that the Wesleyans are about making a move of this nature in connection with the City Road Chapel and he throws it out for the benefit of the divided members of the Tabernacle. Another straw!

The Grindelwald conference has turned out something more than an agreeable picnic; it is gorging the public religious and secular press of England with a full meal of controversy. It was really a very remarkable gathering, and was a natural outcome of the union feeling that every year seems to gain fresh fire and force in England and elsewhere. A good deal of the intellect and piety of the Bench of English Bishops was present in the person of Bishop Perowne. The Old Catholics were represented by Father Hyacinthe, and Methodism, Congregationalism, etc., were represented by such prominent men as Dr. Stephenson, ex-president of the Wesleyan conference, Pasteur Theodore Monod of the French Protestant Church, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, leader of the "Forward Movement"

in the Methodist Church, Rev. Chas. Berry, who might have been Henry Ward Beecher's successor, Rev. Dr. Lunn and many others—a notable gathering, no doubt of it. It may also be said that the members of the conference "tackled" the hard nuts of the reunion question, and did so with a great deal of christian spirit and reverence; and that on the whole the Bishop, Anglican and Nonconformist members, had a good time "spiritually and physically" as long as they stayed at Grindelwald; the storm burst when they all came home. As to the need of the storm one may fairly say that large liberty must be allowed to all who are working this reunion movement. It is folly to suppose that reunion can ever come if every body anxious for it lives in a strait jacket with gags in mouth and in terror of religious newspapers and the gibes of secular papers. There was nothing unusual in the Bishop of Worcester administering the Holy Communion according to the strict rubrics of the Church of England, to any faithful communicant who presented himself or herself to receive it—bishops and clergy are doing it, world over every Sunday in the year. The unusual thing, and one might say, the happy thing, was, that divided Protestantism came to the Holy table—that the conference knelt there and received from the Bishop according to Anglican usage "the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." Many of those who knelt there may never have been confirmed, but this is one of the slightest difficulties to be met with if reunion is ever to come to anything worth speaking about.

Some notable statements were made by very notable men, of which we jot down a few.

REV. C. BERRY, (Congregationalist).—"I am an enthusiastic ecclesiastical re-unionist, but I am in no hurry." "We must all keep up the ideal of reunion"—the ideal not created by us; but created and expressed in words dear to us all in the prayer of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; the hatred of division for its own sake, and the longing for union that Christ through us may win greater honor and glory.

REV. DR. STEPHENSON, (Methodist).—"He did not represent any body but himself, but for himself he must say he strongly believed in the Episcopal system of Church government and had done so for years. He believed it to be most in accordance with christian usage from primitive times, and on the whole most in accord with the practical requirements of the present moment."

REV. H. PRICE HUGHES, (Methodist).—"Fraternalisation would never succeed. The ungodly would never believe in any Church fraternal sentiment until they were united,—until they acted instead of talked. Hence the real goal must be Organic reunion."

"He agreed with others that Episcopacy was a *sine qua non* of reunion. It was for the *benefit* of the Church, if not for the *essence*, and nonconformity must make this concession. They had no right to expect that the ancient Episcopal Church should make all the concessions. He believed with Bishop Lightfoot that Episcopacy had existed since the Apostle John, and if not it certainly had existed as an almost exclusive form of Church government from the second to the sixteenth century."