

abrogating it. . . . For a valid ministry in the Episcopal Church, public prayer with imposition of hands by lawful authority is essential, before any man can be counted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest or deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the functions of its ministry. The canon which merely gives practical application to this could not be repealed without relegating the organic law to neglect and infraction. . . . We are not only free, but we are bound, to make any personal 'sacrifice' and any individual 'contribution' to the noble cause of Christian Unity. But these are things with which we are put in trust, and no man can sacrifice truth, or contribute that which does not belong to him, for any cause in the world."

Says Bishop Niles: "Were all in this Church, in our great love of our separated brethren, to deal untruly with the Episcopate, holding it as a thing which we are free to take up or lay down, aside from the sin of it, we would wholly forfeit our place as a possible intermediary between the Protestant bodies on the one hand and the ancient churches of the East and of Latin Christianity. Surely we ought all to care for the whole family of God."

Bishop M. A. De Wolfe Howe says: "What other organized body of believers will concede as much for the sake of full fellowship as the Protestant Episcopal Church has offered to do? Yet because we cling to one feature which marks our identity, we are setting up a 'barrier to Christian unity.'"

Bishop Scarborough says that "repeal would not help Church Unity. If the canons were repealed, there stands the Ordinal. If we can settle what the original form of the ministry was, as we find it in the New Testament, in the early Church, in the Church for fifteen centuries, and what it is to-day in the great body of believers, our feet will be on solid ground. Undoubtedly the whole question hinges on the Historic Episcopate. All agree to that. The bishops have stated their ground frankly; now let some other body of Christians meet the proposal by stating on what terms they deem organic unity attainable. Surely none would be satisfied with a mere exchange of pulpits!"

Bishop Seymour says: "This teaching of the Ordinal is the heart and soul of the polity of the Catholic Church, since it presents the ministry as official, not personal, and as handing on the government of the Church as established by Christ by the adoption of the same principle which operates to continue all human governments, namely, the principle of succession in office."

"Such action would cut us off from the mighty present as holding, with the historic churches of the world, the same faith and practice which they still maintain. It would leave the Church of Rome, with her corruptions in doctrine and practice, and her frightful usurpation in repealing the charter of Christ, vesting the government of His Church in a corporation and substituting in its place the absolute monarchy of the Papacy in 1870—it would leave, I say, the Church of Rome, the sole historic Church in the West; and give her a triumph, in drawing thousands to her obedience, such as she has never known or dreamed of since Luther challenged and laid bare her abuses and corruptions in 1517."

Bishop Whitehead writes: "That 'Ministerial Reciprocity' is not the panacea for existing divisions is patent to the eye. For, although ostensibly in operation for scores of years among our Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian and Congregational brethren, they are not the less divided into diverse camps, and no strong movement for unity has come from any one of them. If not efficient where it is in constant use, why should it be if given wider scope?"

Bishop Knickerbacker says: "So long as the great mass of Churchmen believe in the divine origin of the Church and ministry as represented by this historic Church, we are not likely to repeal those objectionable canons that restrict interchange of ministrations with those not episcopally ordained."

Bishop Watson writes that "the right or duty of reciprocity depends upon the validity of the commission to be recognized by it. Not being able, so far, to find at present outside the lines of the historic and continuous Episcopate the credentials of a valid ministerial commission, I am compelled to believe that I have no right (however much I may wish to do so) to admit the principle of reciprocity in regard to those outside those lines."

Bishop Gilbert writes that "the whole question at issue is, essentially, Would the repeal of those sections of the canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church which prevent 'Ministerial Reciprocity,' promote organic unity in Christendom? How are we to reach an intelligent conclusion? By reference to the results obtained by so-called 'Ministerial Reciprocity.' Out of this has come only consideration of the question of federation, but federation is not unity. The spirit of denominationalism diminishes not. Could we expect any happier results by the waiving of that claim which alone justifies the Episcopal Church in maintaining a separate organization?"

Says Bishop Thomas: "In my judgment, this

question should not be discussed in the public prints by those who may be called upon to vote in council after invoking the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Whenever a proposition in regard to 'Ministerial Reciprocity' comes before our General Convention, from any Christian communion, it will receive most careful and respectful consideration."

Bishop Adams writes: "We, and we alone, have sent forth a protocol, the solid basis, as we deem it, of a sound and lasting ecclesiastical peace and of a charity which allows the utmost latitude beyond necessary things. To offer more would be to offer what is not ours to give—no, not if all the canons of all the councils were blotted utterly out of existence, and the so-called organic law should follow in their wake."

Bishop Johnson: "There seem to me numberless difficulties in the way of establishing such a reciprocity as is advocated in the article by Dr. Carroll. To admit the Protestant ministers to our pulpits merely as laymen, would be as great an indignity to them as we could offer, and with the present views of the most of our clergy they could be admitted on no other condition. . . . Any idea of a union of all Christians would have to be abandoned if we gave up 'the historic ministry,' which is so tenaciously held by all the most ancient branches of the Church."

This branch of the Church says to her ministers: "I will relieve you of all responsibility in this matter, and forbid you to open your pulpits to any excepting to ministers and duly authorized laymen of this Church whose soundness in the faith can be vouched for."

Bishop Coleman says that he cannot advocate repeal, speaks hopefully of the change of Christian sentiment in favor of Christian Unity, and calls attention to Dr. Shield's "Historic Episcopate" at the point where he says: "Its exclusion of non-Episcopal ministers, though otherwise deemed obnoxious, gives it in fact a unifying quality. By recognizing such ministers it could not help true Church Unity, but would really hinder and frustrate it. It would only make new schisms in trying to heal old ones."

Bishop Grafton thinks that "Ministerial Reciprocity" would prove a hindrance. "The result, unless such ministers were conditionally ordained by our bishops, would be that a large number of our clergy and laity would be so unsettled that they would leave our communion. And, in respect of our now separated Christian brethren, it would only lead to further estrangement; for it would not be such an open and honorable treatment as they could accept; because to admit them by episcopal or canonical license to our pulpits only, and not let them celebrate at our altars, would not be to recognize their equality."

Bishop Wm. A. Leonard writes: "The mere exchange of pulpits will never bring about organic and corporate union between religious societies. Something more vital than social amenities, or evangelical work, or individual ability is requisite, and something besides personal piety and spiritual, subjective experience is demanded. The Church requires credentials and letters of embassy and a well authenticated commission in the regular army for her officers and instructors and leaders; and therefore it is that her Canon on the Ministry stands on her statute books."

With regard to the value of the Historic Episcopate, Bishop Graves writes: "It has proved such a safeguard and blessing that we desire to impart it to all who love the Lord Jesus and appreciate its blessings. From the evident disintegrating tendencies of those Christian bodies which do not have the Episcopate, it would seem to be essential to a vital and lasting unity. Reciprocity, or exchange of pulpits, might possibly be so 'regulated' as not to endanger the principle of the Historic Episcopate, but the 'regulations' would probably be more objectionable than the present status. It does not appear that exchange of pulpits has any appreciable effect in bringing into vital unity those bodies which have practised it. Its value is overestimated."

Says Bishop Jackson, of Alabama, "Ministerial Reciprocity" is a recognition of non-Episcopal orders. Recognition of non-Episcopal orders involves a contravention of our faith, renders our position not only untenable, but absurd, and is a concession to the prevailing idea that the Church is a human society, not a divine institution. A human society may be amended; a divine institution, never."

Bishop Nicholson regards "Ministerial Reciprocity" as a closed question.

Bishop Brooke shows how the canons are but a re-enactment of the fundamental law of the Church.

Bishop Gailor says: "Such a repeal would involve a surrender of the belief in the necessity of episcopal ordination, and, ultimately, a surrender of the Episcopate itself. It might possibly be a long step toward union with a few of our Protestant brethren; but it would certainly be a complete abandonment of even the prospect of visible union with the remaining three-fourths of the Christian world."

Bishop Dudley writes: "I do not see how it is possible for the Episcopal Church to admit to her channels and her pulpits men non-episcopally ordained, whatever be their confessedly great powers

as preachers, and graces as Christians, unless she shall surrender the principle of the Historic Episcopate as one of the things with which she has been put in trust for the benefit of the human race."

Bishop McLaren says: "The repeal of two canons would do nothing for unity. On the contrary, if they were repealed, and if men could be found who would invite, and others found who would accept, the next sad number on the programme would be a disastrous cleavage in what is now one of the most homogeneous bodies in the country. The Anglican communion can do no more than she has done to secure corporate union, unless she surrender herself, her whole being, all that she has stood for and stands for; and no one believes that she will do that."

Bishop Boyd Vincent says: "Those restrictive canons of the Episcopal Church are not conceived in any narrow, sectarian spirit of spiritual self-sufficiency. They were not meant to reflect offensively on 'the ministerial character' or efficiency of our non-Episcopal brethren, apart from the systems they represent. God forbid! We know too well their ability, devotedness and success in saving and edifying souls. But the Episcopal Church, in those canons, looks further afield than the question of individual ministry or mission in our non-Episcopal Churches. They are her standing protest (and the only practical way she has of making it effective) against the sectarian principle itself, against the divisive tendency she sees in non-Episcopal ministries as a system. They are her proclamation of the idea and fact of an historic, Catholic Church, and her vindication of the Historic Episcopate as inseparable from that."

#### WHY AM I A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND?

BY CANON O'MEARA, M.A., ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, WINNIPEG, MAN.

Why am I a member of the Church of England? First—I am a Churchman because the Church of England is intensely and essentially scriptural. She is scriptural in the supreme honour which she assigns to the Word of God. Again and again, in her articles and formularies, she asserts the sole and absolute authority of Holy Scripture as the rule of faith. She acknowledges again and again with emphatic iteration the supremacy of the Word of God over the whole realm of faith and practice; the three Creeds are only to be accepted because "they may be proved by most certain warranty of Holy Scripture," "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain aught contrary to God's word written"; "things ordained by general councils have neither strength nor authority unless it can be declared that they are taken out of Holy Scripture." And above all, she declares in the most emphatic manner that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation. She is scriptural by reason of the prominence which she assigns to the Word of God in her services. Five times during morning prayer, three times during evening prayer, does she cause the Word to be read to the people, and this in addition to the morning and evening Psalms, and many of the chants which are directly taken from Scripture. Take the Word of God out of the Church of England service, and you have taken away far more than half of her whole worship. She is scriptural because she gives her people the whole teaching of the Bible. Every leading incident in our Lord's life, every great doctrine of the Christian faith, every great duty of the Christian life, as contained in Scripture, being brought forward in its due order and relation. This she does by her well arranged system of lessons, and by her recurring fasts and festivals, each illustrative of some special truth, or commemorative of some great Christian event. Limited as is our range of vision, we as clergymen are very apt to pivot round certain pet doctrines and certain favourite events in our Lord's life, and thus to develop what I may call a lob-sided theology. Against this well-known phase of human weakness our Church guards in the manner I have mentioned, so that in every congregation loyal to her method and discipline, not only the pure Word of God, but the whole Word of God, is preached during the course of each ecclesiastical year. For these reasons I hold the Church of England to be a scriptural Church, and therefore I love her and belong to her.

#### APOSTOLIC.

Again, I belong to the Church of England because I believe her to be an Apostolic Church. She is Apostolic in her origin. It seems to me unquestionable that the British Church which had its bishops and its missionary work long before the Roman mission under Augustine began—it seems, I say, unquestionable that the British Church had a continuous line of organization reaching back to the Church of Asia Minor, and so resting upon Apostolic foundation. Now this Apostolic foundation gives two advantages.

(a) It gives unquestionable authority. In the providence of God a necessity may arise for a Church

to constitute authority of increase of spi case with the l without sacrific retain this unl this is a blessi lessly thrown

(b) Her Ap great antiqui dig deep. Th past has by th for the long fu Again, the tolic not only organization a in which to en of Episcopacy. epistles I find Titus for the functions. I Episcopacy we erment very and sub-Apost have crystaliz afterwards as form which I epistles of Ign definitely held tion.

Again I belo she is a Catho trust sense of tion in due ord Catholic in her Christian prac and the baptis gathered in he devotion of a Catholic in the but of Refe gathered from tion, all that v most devout charity and th which she rega Catholic abov great Christian unflinching loy trines of the C

Again I belo she is pre-emi utter mistake are contradicte another as the Church of En of Catholic tru her readiness t kind. And e Protestant wh Reformation, and eminently was her sons. and her laity, secession, foug truth. It was urchy and drev Ridley, Hoope souls went up field, who thu and every cre and an unfette

She is Prote to God's Wor rule of faith. sersion and re Reformation d are accounted merits of our therefore that wholesome do does the Prote through the ce "The just sha

Again, I bel she is pre-emi people: She liturgy. By people are c audible part i could say muc our Church, nothing more dation than h of denominati Lyman Beech when once the off and its us dears itself to the vehicle c