




**IMAGE EVALUATION
TEST TARGET (MT-3)**



**Photographic
Sciences
Corporation**

23 WEST MAIN STREET
WEBSTER, N.Y. 14580
(716) 872-4503

**CIHM/ICMH
Microfiche
Series.**

**CIHM/ICMH
Collection de
microfiches.**



Canadian Institute for Historical Microreproductions / Institut canadien de microreproductions historiques

© 1984

Technical and Bibliographic Notes/Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

- Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur
- Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée
- Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée
- Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque
- Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur
- Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)
- Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur
- Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents
- Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion
along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la
distortion le long de la marge intérieure
- Blank leaves added during restoration may
appear within the text. Whenever possible, these
have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées
lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte,
mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont
pas été filmées.
- Additional comments:/
Commentaires supplémentaires:

- Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur
- Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées
- Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées
- Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées
- Pages detached/
Pages détachées
- Showthrough/
Transparence
- Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression
- Includes supplementary material/
Comprend du matériel supplémentaire
- Only edition available/
Seule édition disponible
- Pages wholly or partially obscured by errata
slips, tissues, etc., have been refilmed to
ensure the best possible image/
Les pages totalement ou partiellement
obscurcies par un feuillet d'errata, une pelure,
etc., ont été filmées à nouveau de façon à
obtenir la meilleure image possible.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
				✓							

The copy filmed here has been reproduced thanks to the generosity of:




Anglican Church of Canada
Synod Archives

The images appearing here are the best quality possible considering the condition and legibility of the original copy and in keeping with the filming contract specifications.

Original copies in printed paper covers are filmed beginning with the front cover and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression, or the back cover when appropriate. All other original copies are filmed beginning on the first page with a printed or illustrated impression, and ending on the last page with a printed or illustrated impression.

The last recorded frame on each microfiche shall contain the symbol \rightarrow (meaning "CONTINUED"), or the symbol ∇ (meaning "END"), whichever applies.

Maps, plates, charts, etc., may be filmed at different reduction ratios. Those too large to be entirely included in one exposure are filmed beginning in the upper left hand corner, left to right and top to bottom, as many frames as required. The following diagrams illustrate the method:



L'exemplaire filmé fut reproduit grâce à la générosité de:

Anglican Church of Canada
Synod Archives

Les images suivantes ont été reproduites avec le plus grand soin, compte tenu de la condition et de la netteté de l'exemplaire filmé, et en conformité avec les conditions du contrat de filmage.

Les exemplaires originaux dont la couverture en papier est imprimée sont filmés en commençant par le premier plat et en terminant soit par la dernière page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration, soit par le second plat, selon le cas. Tous les autres exemplaires originaux sont filmés en commençant par la première page qui comporte une empreinte d'impression ou d'illustration et en terminant par la dernière page qui comporte une telle empreinte.

Un des symboles suivants apparaîtra sur la dernière image de chaque microfiche, selon le cas: le symbole \rightarrow signifie "A SUIVRE", le symbole ∇ signifie "FIN".

Les cartes, planches, tableaux, etc., peuvent être filmés à des taux de réduction différents. Lorsque le document est trop grand pour être reproduit en un seul cliché, il est filmé à partir de l'angle supérieur gauche, de gauche à droite, et de haut en bas, en prenant le nombre d'images nécessaire. Les diagrammes suivants illustrent la méthode.

re
étails
es du
modifier
ar une
ilimage

es

errata
to

e pelure,
on à



32X

A. J. Lewis
THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

MM 53
R24

CORRESPONDENCE

ADDRESSED TO

THE RIGHT REVD. DR. LEWIS,

BISHOP OF ONTARIO, AND OTHERS,

(THROUGH THE OTTAWA PRESS)

— ON THE SUBJECT OF THE

*Romanizing and Ritualistic Practices and
Teaching of the Church of England;*

AND THE

REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH,

NOW FIRMLY ESTABLISHED IN OTTAWA; AND MONCTON,
NEW BRUNSWICK.

Am

OTTAWA:

PRINTED BY A. S. WOODBURN, ELGIN STREET.

1874.



THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

1911

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
LIBRARY

1911

in every Diocese who are aware that such a prayer exists in the
Book of England Prayer Book, and nine out of every ten will
be glad to know that it does exist, and desire that it be expunged as
soon as possible. No Roman Diocese in England could be stronger.

But the above is only carrying out the power given them by
the the Ordination service of the Church of England which the
Bishop gives in the following words: "Receive the Holy Ghost
for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, with com-
mission and authority, as in all things to follow the example of the
Apostles and their successors, who have received the same from the
Lord Jesus Christ, who sits at the right hand of his Father, and
who will be with thee and give thee strength. Whosoever shall bind
on earth shall be bound on earth, and whosoever shall loose on
earth shall be loosed on heaven: whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth
shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth
shall be loosed in heaven: and I give thee power, as the Father has
given me, that whosoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in
heaven, and whosoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in
heaven: and I give thee power, as the Father has given me, that
whosoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and
whosoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

Question: "Do you believe that your Holy Father can offer
Mass for the living and the dead?" Answer: "The Pope has no power
to forgive sins but God alone." Question: "Do you believe that
the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

Question: "Do you believe that the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

Question: "Do you believe that the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

Question: "Do you believe that the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

Question: "Do you believe that the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

Question: "Do you believe that the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

Question: "Do you believe that the Pope can forgive sins?" Answer: "No one can forgive sins but God."

"disbeliefs" expressed in very plain terms in my last communication; I take it to be so on two grounds, firstly, as the "Head of the Church" here, to bring the erring brethren, as you believe us to be, back into the fold; and secondly, to prevent others from going astray, for you may rest assured, my Lord, there are thousands now attendants and even communicants in this diocese and throughout the Dominion who think exactly as we do, and who sooner or later will join us just as circumstances admit.

We know my Lord, that a certain class are very apt to attach opprobrium to anyone leaving the church they have been born and brought up in, and the dread of this may for a time deter many from joining us at the moment. When I say thousands of Churchmen think as we do. I include many of the Clergy also, and your Lordship is candid enough to admit "that there are Bishops, Priests and Deacons who hold these disbeliefs and their livings also." This is a melancholy admission coming from a Bishop of the Church, and one cannot otherwise than believe that it is only their "livings" that keep them in the Church—hence it must be admitted that Bishop Cummins and his conferees certainly deserve the highest credit and the sympathy of real Churchmen, or I should say real Christians, for having preferred the faith to the "Flesh Pots." We do not admit having left the Church, but the Church has left us.

The difference of opinion, however, among the Clergy has long been well understood. For anyone who has attended any of the Diocesan Synods must have heard various clergymen, in addressing the Synod, refer to the PARTY with whom they generally acted. This speaks badly for the unity of the Church and clearly demonstrated that some change is required. It may be said, why do not the laity try to reform matters through the Synod? I am not aware, my Lord, how the laity are treated at the Synod of this diocese, but my own experience as a delegate to the diocese of Toronto, fully convinces me that the lay delegates as a rule are the nominees of the clergymen or their friends, and I recollect distinctly on the occasion of a lay delegate standing up in the Synod to speak on some objectionable doctrine said to be taught at Trinity College, Toronto, that he was fairly hissed down by the "educated Clergy." Again, a rule existed there that anyone addressing the Synod should do so from the platform where the Bishop presided. Now, as a rule, laymen are diffident, and not public speakers, and it really did appear as if this rule was made to deter them from expressing their opinions.

You refer my Lord, to Bishop Cummins having at one time been a Methodist Minister, and you are generous enough to say, "I suppose that he would have said that it was 'the Lord who put it into his heart.'" I will not accuse your Lordship for a moment of entertaining the idea that the ministrations of a "Methodist Minister" are not as acceptable to Almighty God as those of a Clergyman of the Church of England. I could not possibly imagine your Lordship so wanting in Christian charity, although the remarks might

bear t
this C
Minis
serv
the "

eight
Not n
their
letter
broug
Roma
ionab
conve
Chur
harve

the s
him.
reaso
Lord
meet
deno
'tis o
tion
city
Rom
Engl

exco
pate

and
Ref
reg
Hou
his

you
desi
disc
ano

thru
at s
awa
rest

bear that inference. I believe there is in this diocese, and close to this City, one of your Lordship's Clergy, who was also a "Methodist Minister" a gentleman highly esteemed in this Community, and deservedly so, and whose theology would not, I am sure, coincide with the "Priest of St. Albans."

You say, my Lord, that it has taken Bishop Cummins twenty-eight years to find out that the Prayer Book is full of Popery. Not necessarily so. Thousands of Churchmen have seen that from their boyhood, but it was looked upon in a great measure as a dead letter, and it is only lately that it has been attempted to be brought into practice, and we all see the evil effects of it, and the Roman Catholic body rejoice in the fact that bringing these objectionable matters into practice in the church has brought thousands of converts to their faith, and there is little doubt the "Reformed Church" is not looked upon with favor by that body. It spoils the harvest.

You give as a reason for Bishop Cummins' secession, "Because the spirit of bigotry which is akin to that of persecution actuates him." Pardon me for calling this a most unfortunate and damaging reason on your Lordship's part. Bigotry, my Lord! Will your Lordship, or any considerable number of your clergy, consent to meet on common grounds with the clergy of the other Protestant denominations for any good Christian purpose? Certainly not; 'tis only some two months back when a large temperance demonstration took place in this city, and every Christian denomination in this city was represented on the platform by its clergy, even to those of the Roman Catholic clergy (much to their credit), *but not one Church of England clergyman was there!* Is this bigotry, my Lord, or what is it?

Then, as to persecution, in what category are we to class the late excommunications by your Lordship's orders? Surely not clerical or paternal solicitude—but "curses like chickens come home to roost."

The "Priest of St. Alban's" and your lordship also seem anxious and almost express a doubt as to whether or no the members of the Reformed Church are not "Drunkards and Infidels." 'Tis to be regretted that the "Priest of St. Alban's" had not visited the Court House yesterday either at morning or evening service, and I fancy his mind at all events would have been quite at ease on that score.

I feel that I ought to apologize to your Lordship for addressing you *anonymously*. My *only* reason for so doing is, that I do not desire or court public notoriety, and I feel that the matter under discussion is of vital importance, and ought to be settled one way or another.

I do not expect that your Lordship will notice my letters through the press, but perhaps you will be so kind on some evening, at an early date, at the Bishop's Chapel, to endeavour to explain away our "disbeliefs," as stated in my previous communication, and rest assured, my Lord, you would have a large and anxious audience.

I have the honor to be,

Your Lordship's obed't Servant,

SENEX.

Ottawa, 16th March, 1874.

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

To the Editor of *The Citizen* :

DEAR SIR,—I observe a communication in the *Free Press* of last evening, signed "W. R. B.," calling on us "Schismatics" to purchase a book at Durie's, called "Church Doctrine—Bible Truth," and study it for our edification, believing that our knowledge of the Church of England Prayer Book is very limited. No doubt "W. R. B." has studied this book and feels perfectly convinced that the Book of Common Prayer is far before the Bible as a guide, although the one is the inspiration of Almighty God, and the other is in a great measure concocted by designing "Priests" to give them priestly or sacerdotal power over the laity.

We are told in the New Testament to "search the *Scriptures* ; for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me," and I cannot find anywhere in the Bible that we are referred to any Prayer Book or any other book the work of men's hands, on which to ground our faith. We Schismatics are vain enough to think that we are endowed with about as fair a share of common sense as those who malign us, and we feel that we are quite competent to judge for ourselves, with the help of Almighty God, as to what we have to do in this world, to ensure our eternal happiness in the world to come.

We don't want to be "logically shown" that black means white or any other color.

We know there are many good parts in the Book of Common Prayer which we will retain and add others as we deem fit.

We want no Prayer Book with tables of "Saints' Days," "Moveable and Immoveable Feasts," "Vigils, Fasts, and Days of Abstinence." We don't believe that we shall be called to account in another world as to whether we have eat fish or flesh on certain days. We don't believe that any clergyman, be he arch-bishop, bishop, priest, or deacon, has the power either to forgive or retain our sins, or empower others to do so. We don't believe that those who do not believe in the Athanasian Creed "cannot be saved," and we do not believe that regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism. We do not believe in auricular confession of our sins to a priest and his absolution, and we do not believe that in partaking of the Holy Sacrament we are "verily and indeed" eating and drinking the "body and blood of Christ," nor do we believe in the commination ordered to be used on the first day of Lent. All these things are clearly enjoined in very plain language in the Book of Common Prayer, and if the words do not mean what they so clearly express, let them be expunged, and then no book on "Church Doctrine" will be required to explain them away. As His Lordship Bishop Lewis *kindly* states we are more anxious to tell what we disbelieve than what we believe, I would respectfully state for His Lordship's information, as well as others, that we believe everything expressed in the Apostles' Creed. We believe "no one can forgive sins but God." We look for salvation through Jesus Christ, the

AT&I dnmk A&I awano

sole Mediator between God and man. We believe faith without works is of no avail. We believe we should lead godly, righteous, and sober lives, and in all things act as becomes Christian men and women, and to do our duty in that state of life unto which it hath pleased God to call us.

Have you any fault to find, Mr. W. R. B., with this synopsis of our creed? We don't believe the author of "Church Doctrine" could in any way improve it; at all events we are satisfied with it, and if we only live up to it—which we will with God's help endeavor to do—we believe we shall on the great day, when we must all give account of the deeds done in the body, stand quite as well in the eyes of Almighty God as those who believe more than we do and are apparently so anxious about our future welfare.

Many believe that the Roman Catholic faith is, that "out of the Church of Rome" there is no salvation. I don't think Catholics believe any such thing; but the arbitrary position now assumed by one portion of the Church of England would lead me to believe that their faith was that out of the present Church of England there was no salvation.

We may not, in our branch of the present Church of Christ; have quite as many fashionable people, attired in broadcloth, and silks and satins, as the Church of England may boast of, but I am sure we shall have quite as good and earnest Christians; and we shall endeavor to have clergymen who will find time to visit the poor and humble as well as their richer brethren.

The considerate "Priest of St. Albans" has on more than one occasion referred to our present pastor in terms anything but becoming a Christian minister, and a serious charge seems to be that Dr. Gallagher is an American. I presume he had not the choice as to where he would be born; but perhaps the "Priest of St. Albans" believes that when our Saviour said to the Apostles, "Go ye forth into all the world and preach the Gospel unto every creature," he only meant that their successors should be the clergy of the Church of England, or Americans specially excluded; and the poor American Presbyterian missionary; who has just been chopped to pieces by a set of savages in Mexico, was perhaps served right, as—according to the "Priest of St. Albans"—he had no business there.

I remain, yours, truly,

DUTHER II.

Ottawa, March 18, 1874.

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

To the RT. REV. DR. LEWIS, *Bishop of Ontario* :

MY LORD,—In my last I respectfully laid before you how desirable it would be for your Lordship at your early convenience, at your own chapel, to explain away the "disbeliefs" of those who have joined the "Reformed Episcopal Church" assuring your Lordship of a "large and anxious audience."

I regret your Lordship has not condescended to accede to the suggestion, especially at this particular season of the year, the approach of Easter, when so many are supposed to be preparing themselves to carry out the command of our Saviour: "Do this in remembrance of me," and it would have been well to satisfy their minds on so important a matter, and possibly bring some of the stray sheep back into the fold. That is your duty, my Lord.

But it would almost appear, from your Lordship's letter to the Rev. Dr. Cordner, a Unitarian clergyman, published in the *Montreal Gazette*, that you are more desirous of his good opinion and those around him, than the people of your Lordship's Diocese.

You are pleased to say, my Lord, that "no clergyman of this city has, to my knowledge, 'repelled' anyone from Holy Communion," while you at the same time state that you instructed your curate to see a certain *person*, one of your congregation, which he did and "expressed the hope that as he had left the Church he would not come to holy communion next Lord's day." If this is not "repelling," my Lord, I should really like to know what it is. This *person*, it would appear, was a communicant, and had he presented himself at the altar railing to receive communion, 'tis beyond a doubt he would have been "repelled," and why? Simply, because he had stated that in receiving the holy communion, he did not believe he was "*verily and indeed receiving the body and blood of Christ*," and this in a Protestant Episcopal Church. Except as regards "notorious evil livers," the impression has been that the communion of the Church of England was open to all who "truly and earnestly repent of their sins, are in love and charity with their neighbors, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, &c.," but it would appear it is not the intending communicant who is to judge between himself and his Maker as to his being in a fit state of mind to approach the holy table—the Priest or Bishop is to be the judge. If so, why not adopt the confessional at once?

But, my Lord, rumour hath it, that a letter is in existence or was said to have emanated from your Lordship, to your Curate, officially notifying the *person* that he was excommunicated. I do not vouch for the correctness of this myself, but the authority I have it from is good.

But, my Lord, if there has been no act of excommunication in the city, how is it in Hazeldean, in your Lordship's Diocese, where the Rev. Mr. Mulvaney, under his own hand published a letter to the effect that he had excommunicated Messrs. Jno. Clarke and Jno. Hodgins with your Lordship's orders, given Mr. Mulvaney in the presence of a churchwarden.

Has a "Priest" the power to excommunicate while it does not form a part of a Bishop's duty. There is certainly something wrong in this matter one way or the other.

Referring, my Lord, to the Rev. Dr. Cordner's reply to your Lordship, it would appear, it is not "churchmen" alone, who have noticed the innovations in the Church during the past thirty years,

for D
chang
surpr

the l
poop
pora
tainl

Lord

Otta

unde

He s

sens

you

bish

teriz

we r

mati

cong

publ

was

Lew

with

the

corn

of o

sett

has

seri

cur

rep

the

rec

int

the

con

To

for

we

th

for Dr. Cordner in very plain terms, states or implies that from the changes that have taken place during that period, it would not surprise him if excommunication was put in practice.

In fact, my Lord, the feeling among a very large portion of the laity, is that the Clergy have been and are working to get the people in their power, so that they may lead them in things temporal as well as spiritual, and in this advanced age they most certainly will not succeed, but most signally fail.

Your Lordship's most obedient servant,

SENEX.

Ottawa, 23rd March, 1874.

[We must admit we were surprised to see a letter from His Lordship in the *Montreal Gazette*, under the heading, "The Alleged Ottawa Excommunication," and giving the public of that city to understand that no excommunication had taken place in Ottawa. He says—"I do not wonder at your being deceived by the false and sensational telegrams sent to the press from this city, and perhaps you do not know that to issue excommunications is no part of a bishop's duty." As all these telegrams which His Lordship characterizes as "false and injurious," give the *Citizen* as their authority, we must, in justice to ourselves, assure our readers that the information was furnished us by a leading member of Rev. Dr. Jones' congregation. It was brought to us with a request that we would publish it, and we had no doubt at the time that the information was supplied us with the sanction, if not at the instance of Bishop Lewis. Coming, as it did, from such a respectable source, we must, with all the respect due to the position of His Lordship, adhere to the belief that Mr. J. B. Stoacy was formally excommunicated from the Anglican Church. If Bishop Lewis wishes to publicly deny the correctness of our information, we are authorized to give the name of our informant, with whom we will then leave His Lordship to settle the matter.]

While on this subject, we may also refer to a statement which has been extensively circulated to the effect that our report of the sermon delivered in the Chapel of Ease by Bishop Lewis was inaccurate, especially in that part of it in which His Lordship was reported as saying of the English Church—"It was the church of the educated wherever established." For confirmation of the correctness of our report we refer any of our readers who may be interested in the matter to His Lordship, Bishop Lewis, who saw the report before it was published, and said that it was substantially correct, though not absolutely verbatim.—ED. CITIZEN.]

"FATHER IGNATIUS."

To the Editor of the *Citizen*.

DEAR SIR,—I have been looking forward with some anxiety for this "learned Pundit's" authority which he promised in his wonderful and pompous communication of 19th instant, to prove that the faith of the Church of England consisted in the belief in

the "Apostles, Nicene and Athanasian creeds—the Divine authority of the Apostolic succession—regeneration in baptism—real presence—auricular confession—the seven sacraments—prayers for the dead—invocation of saints and angels, and observance of the "fasts and festivals of the Church."

I imagine His Lordship Bishop Lewis or even the "Priest of St. Albans" will scarcely endorse the faith of this learned disciple of Ignatius Loyala, of whom he is no doubt a lineal descendant.

I observe "Ignatius" says he will "endeavor" to give his authority, and perhaps his endeavours have not yet met with success. Will he permit me to suggest to him Den's Theology or a "Roman Catholic Missal" as perhaps the best authority he can find on the subject.

As Ignatius suggests, we are perfectly aware that the book of Common Prayer unfortunately contains many of these points of his faith, but they have until lately been attempted to be taught in the Church of England, and we boldly assert that no clergyman of that Church, even in this degenerate age, dare, from the pulpit, attempt to promulgate or defend any such doctrine.

Notwithstanding that we are accused by Bishop Lewis, the "Priest of St. Albans," and by the learned "Ignatius," of being of "doubtful education," we feel that the Almighty has given us a fair share of common sense—at all events quite sufficient to know Protestant teaching from Roman Catholic—and we have moral courage enough to stand forward and defend those principles which King William fought for at the Boyne, and to show an arrogant and designing priesthood that we will not imperceptibly be drawn into Roman Catholic practices, or allow our children to be taught Roman Catholic doctrine, to suit their selfish ends.

We may not all have had the advantages of a high education as "Ignatius" and his friends assume to have, and it's God's blessing that we have not, if we were not able to turn it to better account than they seem to do.

We were never in our early days taught the doctrine now attempted to be forced upon us. Many of the churches called Protestant and Episcopal we can scarcely recognize as such. The whole system is repugnant to our feelings, and although we love and revere the church of our fathers, we do not and cannot recognize the present Church of England as that church, and all the old Prayer Books or books on "Church Discipline" or ancient authorities, "Ignatius" or any one else can produce, will never make us believe in priestly absolution and all the other absurdities attempted to be forced down our throats.

As to Bishop Lewis' threats of excommunication, and being deprived of all the privileges and rights of the church, we attach just that importance to them they merit. They fall very lightly on us, and we believe the day will come when His Lordship will regret the course he has pursued.

The New Testament tells us "God is no respecter of persons, but in every nation he that feareth him and worketh righteousness

is ac
Bisho
who,
on hi

the B
ing t
of it
nine-
taugh
and s
Writ

of th
crisi
and
"ron
that
defo
the
Chu

To

bro
cate
app

the
mo
be

ma
a l
He
les
ita
Er
inc
va

Sc
th
ch

R

is accepted with him." We prefer this theology either to the Bishops or that of Ignatius, or even the "Priest of St. Alban's," who, we are informed, finds great consolation in kissing the Cross on his stole when he enrobes himself.

We "few men of doubtful education" have no intention of *revising* the Prayer Book, as "Ignatius" suggests, unless he considers applying the scissors to it revising it. We wish and intend to take out of it everything which we do not believe and which we know nine-tenths of "churchmen" do not believe, which we were never taught to believe, and which we don't want to believe, for the good and sufficient reason that we do not believe it is founded on Holy Writ or has any foundation but priestcraft.

There are in this Dominion thousands of Orangemen members of the Church of England. I would appeal to them at the present crisis to come forward and respectfully, but firmly tell the Bishops and Clergy of the Church that they repudiate the innovations and "remnants of Popery" attempted to be introduced into the Church, that they protest against the teaching such as "Ignatius" would defend, and caution them that unless these things are put right, that the Church of England will cease to be looked upon as a Protestant Church.

LUTHER II.

OTTAWA, 24th March, 1874.

"A VOICE FROM THE BACKWOODS."

To the Editor of The Citizen.

SIR,—Under the above "Nom de Plume" I find "Senex" is brought to account in your issue of yesterday, for the doctrine advocated in his various letters, and which have so generally been approved of by the Protestant community.

The writer is, without doubt, one of the fraternity who find the ground going from under them, and are on the retrograde movement. The style and argument is so apparent that it cannot be mistaken.

This "Defender of the Faith" is candid, at all events, and makes an admission for which I thank him, but which, I am afraid, a large portion of the members of the Church of England will not. He says: "Can 'Senex' name the time when our Prayer Book was less Catholic than now, or can he show *when or where* our Church calls itself Protestant?" So, according to this learned backwoodsman, English Churchmen are not Protestants!! This will be news, indeed, to thousands, and there surely will be a clearing out in the various Orange Lodges.

Has this backwoodsman ever read the oath taken by the Sovereigns of Great Britain and Ireland on their accession to the throne? If he has not he had better do so, and, I fancy, he will change his mind on this subject.

The writer also says: "Senex" makes it a grievance "that Roman Catholics worship and kneel down and cross themselves in

an English Church in Toronto," this perversion is worthy of a "Catholic (not Roman) Jesuit." "Senex" stated what he had seen in Toronto with no desire to sneer at the faith or form of worship of the Roman Catholic, but to show that the form of worship followed in the Ritualistic churches so much resembled that of the Church of Rome, that Roman Catholics mistook these churches for their own.

'Tis to be regretted that this backwoodsman could not find it convenient to attend next Sunday at the Court House, and he would then see whether we "good, staunch Protestants worship sitting in high-backed pews with ducked heads during the prayers." I take it he might derive some little benefit by his attendance, if it were only in the shape of Christian charity, of which he seems woefully deficient. One thing at all events is not practised among us, we don't sing our prayers or get men in dirty white nightgowns to sing them for us.

Will this worthy backwoodsman, if he is a "priest," which I more than suspect, dare to tell his congregation that *he has the power*, duly commissioned by our Saviour, to forgive or retain sins, or tell them that, in receiving the Holy Communion, they are "verily and indeed" eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ? He knows well he dare do no such thing, but he and such as he are trying hard to get the laity schooled to such a belief, and if they are not stopped they will succeed in instilling such doctrine, which certainly is not Protestant, into the minds of our children through the Sunday School—but I forget, "Backwoodsman" is not a Protestant, he is a member of the "Catholic Church of England." "O tempora, O mores."

"Senex" never wrote any such thing as "that the thirty-nine articles were only given for the guidance of the clergy." What he did say was, that they were not taught or read in Sunday Schools or families and were *looked upon more as a guide to the clergy than anything else*.

As to the "Apostolic Succession," it is such an absurd hallucination that I do not deem it worthy of notice, but admitting for argument sake, that it does exist in this so called "Catholic Church of England," where did it come from? Why, introduced through the instrumentality of an Apostate priest of the Church of Rome, a bantling worthy of the source from whence it sprung.

The next time this "voice from the back woods" favors us with its sweet sounds will he be pleased to stick to the truth and not misquote to suit his miserable argument.

I do not know that "Senex" will thank me for taking his part in the matter, as he has pretty well shown that he can take his own part, but knowing he is absent from the city, I have thought well to do so.

I observe also in last evening's issue a long water-gruel epistle from my friend "Ignatius" on the Apostolic Succession. It is really not worth answering, it is perfect twaddle worthy of a village schoolmaster. There is one point, however, which may be noticed,

that,
kind
pastor
want

that
them
it, th
fellow
invite
fore,

Bisho
with
that
Phil

To t

sign
men
Rev
had
Gos
the
beli
it re
he
fath
som
nev
form

and
Gal
I c
cop
us
Ta
Ch

ho
wo
his
at

that, having reference to ordination by dissenters. "Ignatius" is kind enough to say, "Do they not rather send for two or three pastors who have been already ordained *in their way* to do what they want?"

It is to be presumed from the words *in their way* being in italics, that "Ignatius" has not much faith in it, and does not recognize them as successors to the Apostles, still a much greater man, I take it, than "Ignatius" does recognize them as "Fellow laborers and fellow servants in the Gospel," and opens his pulpit to them and invites them in, viz:—The Archbishop of Canterbury—what, therefore, becomes of all your logic learned, Ignatius?

And it must not be forgotten, "Most Learned Pundit," that Bishop Cummins is what you would call a successor to the Apostles with all the necessary power—so our minds may be quite easy on that score, if we had any scruples. "I will write thee again from Philippi."

LUTHER II.

OTTAWA, 25th March, 1874.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

To the Editor of THE CITIZEN:

DEAR SIR,—In your issue of last evening, a writer under the signature "True" tried very hard to make it appear that the statement made by Mr. Gallagher (as he is polite enough to call the Rev. Gentleman), to the effect that the Archbishop of Canterbury had declared himself a "fellow laborer and fellow servant in the Gospel" with non-conformist clergymen and thrown the pulpits of the Episcopal Church open to them, as a "hoax," and calls on us to believe it as such on his simple *ipse dixit*. As he says he has seen it referred to as such in an English paper he occasionally reads, but he does not state what that paper is, no doubt the "wish is the father of the thought" with the writer. Perhaps he has read it in some "High Church" organ which does not approve of such good news being promulgated for the benefit of low churchmen or nonconformists.

The writer states he is a diligent reader of English newspapers and has not come across the statement made by the Rev. Mr. Gallagher, except in the manner he has told it—as a hoax. Well, I can produce half a dozen gentlemen who read it in a Scotch paper, copied from an English one as no hoax, but a reality, and none of us were "startled by the statement," but looked upon it that Dr. Tait was simply making the world aware that he was a good Christian and no bigot.

And we must have some more substantial proof of it being a hoax before we or the public can be expected to swallow "True's" wonderful discovery, and from the narrow minded style evinced in his production, we would require proof beyond him to convince us, at all events, that it is a hoax.

I am sure Dr. Gallagher and his friends must feel under deep obligation to this self-sufficient gentleman, for his impertinent advice to be more cautious in our statements; when we want advice, I am sure it will not be to one of the writer's qualifications we will apply to and it will be time enough for him to give advice when it is asked for.

Pray don't be alarmed, Mr. "True," even the displeasure of the Archbishop of Canterbury would not deter us from the course we are pursuing; we appeal to a much higher power than even an Archbishop as to the recitude of our acts—our motto is—*Deus est qui regit omnia*.

Was it a hoax, Mr. "True," our glorious and good Queen receiving the Holy Communion in the Presbyterian Church at Crathie? or was it a hoax that a certain high dignitary in the English Episcopal Church took an active part at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance lately held in New York, and partook of the Holy Communion at the hands of a non-conformist minister.

Mr. "True" must have been awfully "startled" on reading that in his "English newspapers." Still, the world goes on, and the Archbishop of Canterbury did not *excommunicate* either of the delinquents, and I don't think Bishop Lewis would undertake to "repell" either of them from the Communion in his chapel.

LUTHER II.

OTTAWA, 26th March, 1874.

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

To the RIGHT REV. DR. LEWIS, Bishop of Ontario:

MY LORD,—I find in the *Church Herald* of Toronto, the 26th inst., the following:—

A NOTE FROM OTTAWA.

"The Rev. H. Pollard writes from Ottawa, March 20th, that an 'absurd telegram' about excommunication had misled us in the *Church Herald* of March 12. 'There is not a word of truth in such a report,' says our correspondent, which we are truly happy to publish it. He continues: "I presume the report arose from my suggesting to a member of the congregation the propriety of his absenting himself from the Holy Communion, partly in consequence of his having announced to the Bishop and myself his intention of joining the new sect unless his Lordship would *alter the Prayer Book* to suit his particular views. I may add that of the few that have left us, he is about the only one who has been a communicant."

It is to be regretted your curate should so far forget himself as to publish statements which are so far from being correct. With regard to the excommunication, will the reverend gentleman please send to the *Herald* Your Lordship's note relative to the "Steacy" matter, and then we shall see if it is excommunication or not; but what of the Hazeidean affair? There can be no doubt of the

excommunication there, after what has appeared in the *Press* of this city, and of which the Rev. Mr. Pollard cannot pretend to plead ignorance.

With regard to the "*person*" above referred to being "about the only communicant who has left," your curate must know better, I can without difficulty name twenty-five communicants who have left and joined the "Reformed Church," and one of them a communicant in the Church of England before your Lordship or any of the clergy now in the city were in holy orders.

If your curate would send one of his emissaries to the Reformed Church on Easter Sunday, I am inclined to think he will find more communicants than he would care to report to the *Church Herald* for publication.

I observe, my Lord, that a correspondent of the *Citizen* has published a statement to the effect that the Archbishop of Canterbury has *not* opened his pulpits to Nonconformist clergymen, as claimed by an extract published here from an English newspaper, but, so far, we have a statement on each side of the question—one that it is so; another, that it is a "hoax"—so that we must wait for further information before any correct decision can be come to in the matter; but, my Lord, I am charitable enough to pray and hope that the Archbishop is the good Christian that the extract in question would make him out to be.

I cannot believe, my Lord, that you feel that your ministration or that of any of your clergy are more acceptable at the throne of Almighty God, than that of any of the Nonconformist clergymen of this city, or that the Almighty has commissioned you and not them. The idea seems repugnant to common sense, and would make the Almighty appear not that impartial being we, as Christians believe him to be, and no respecter of persons.

I am given to understand, my Lord, that on Sunday evening next it is your intention to some extent to touch on the "disbeliefs of the Reformed Church." I hope it is so, and that Your Lordship will be able to show that there was *no breach* of church discipline in Her Majesty the Queen and the Dean of Canterbury joining with Nonconformist clergymen in religious observances in Nonconformist churches, and receiving the Holy Communion at their hands; but that it is a great crime deserving of excommunication for humble men in this city to be guilty of any such breach, and, as Your Lordship has said, "They will be inadmissible to the Communion, and deprived of all the Privileges and rights of the Church."

My Lord, when we shall one day appear before the Throne of Almighty God to give an account of our stewardship in this world, as we most assuredly shall do, do you, my Lord, believe that your position will be any different from that of Non-conformist clergymen or laymen? Do you believe there will be any difference between the beggar and the Queen? I trow not. Then why should there be any difference in church discipline in this world between the Queen and the humblest of her subjects.

If you are right in your church discipline, why has not the Archbishop of Canterbury "repelled" or excommunicated Her Majesty and the Dean of Canterbury.

I see, my Lord, that several of our opponents refer to us as "men of doubtful education"—tailors, bakers and Custom House officers. We have yet to learn that pure religion, virtue and morality belong exclusively to those who assume to themselves the title of the "upper class." We are not ashamed of our records, and if personality is to take the place of reason and argument, we would rather not descend to it; but, rest assured, my Lord, we are quite able to defend ourselves, and also to show to the public that those who would malign and reproach us are not quite the incarnation of morality and virtue they would have the outside world believe, and that not confined to the laity. The greatest man who ever trod this earth was a carpenter.

In your published address with reference to the contemplated revision of the Prayer Book in Ireland, you are pleased to say "I hope it will not be carried out, as the result will be a disruption." Are we to understand from this, my Lord, that you prefer a corrupt temporal state of things in the Church to a purer faith?

We hear in every quarter this Church matter discussed, and we hear the clergy and others asking, who is Sonex? and who is Luther? and who is Ignatius? and such questions. Now these are questions of not the slightest consequence, we are willing to admit they are all three very common place individuals; but what is wanted is a refutation of what they have advanced if incorrect, and it is to be hope your Lordship will go fully into it on Sunday evening.

Your Lordship's
Obedient servant,

SENEX.

OTTAWA, March 28th, 1874.

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

To the Editor of the Citizen.

I did not intend to discuss the Church question any further, but my two admirers "A voice from the Back Woods," and "Ignatius," persevere in their absurdities, and I feel that I must have a parting word with them at all events. As regards the smaller fry, they are not worth noticing.

If, however, it is any consolation or comfort to all my opponents, I am quite willing to be considered "ignorant," "self-conceited," and any other polite appellation they may choose to apply to me; they must feel their case a weak one, when they descended to personalities, and they should recollect the old adage "People who live in glass houses, should not throw stones."

The two correspondents above named, have given the public to understand the faith of the Church of England to be—

Belief in the three creeds, apostolic succession, regeneration in baptism, real presence, the seven sacraments, prayers for the dead, invocation of saints and angels, the fasts and festivals of the Church, and last, though not least, confession and priestly absolution.

It must bring a smile to the face of a Roman Catholic to hear any one admit his belief in the above, and call himself a Protestant.

But I must apologise, neither "Ignatius," nor "The Voice" are Protestants, they are members of the "Catholic Church of England," and "Ignatius" says "She has never been looked upon as a Protestant Church by any of her true members, and she certainly never has *laid any claim* to that ambiguous title."

Now, these are plain words, and if true, would, I am sure, astonish not a few "Churchmen," but fortunately they are not true—Witness the Sovereign's oath on accession to the throne; but in case more to the point, is the "clergy reserve" question in this Canada of ours. A certain portion of the lands of the crown were set apart for the benefit of a "Protestant Clergy," and hard indeed did the Church of England fight to prove she was the *only Protestant Church*, and attempted to deny the right of any of the other Protestant sects to participate in the distribution, and when the commutation took place, she got the lion's share as being a part of the "Protestant Clergy."

What say you to this learned "Ignatius," 'tis a weakness among the "Apostolic Successors" to be fond of money, and they even allow themselves to be called a "Protestant Clergy," in order to get a share of the "Flesh Pots," and pretended that they were the only "Protestant Clergy," in order to get the whole, and now, according to this "learned pundit" "Ignatius," they are not Protestants, and never were. Most learned "Ignatius," a second Daniel!

What a truly Christian Church "Ignatius" would make the "Catholic Church of England" to be, and of which he is so worthy an ornament. In his last letter he says, with reference to the Apostolic succession:—"It is quite plain that any community which is without this succession is not a rightly constituted branch of the Church of Christ; if it is governed and taught by self-appointed ministers, it has no sanction whatever from the Word of God. To speak in the mildest terms possible, it is entirely doubtful whether any acts of those self-appointed ministers are acceptable to God, and it is entirely doubtful whether the members of that community ever can receive the Sacrament." There is a specimen of Christian charity for our Non-conformist brethren.—"Who art thou that judgeth another man's servant?" And again, this worthy and "learned pundit" says: "From what experience I have had of Protestants, I am sorry to say that I have seen but few who would listen to anything like reason.

This is the style of champion the Church of England requires at the present moment, and who is undertaking to teach the community theology and what real Christianity is? Rumor says he is one of the "successors to the Apostles." If so, a worthy specimen, truly.

Pray, learned "Ignatius," enlighten us where these epistles of your patron saint, "St. Ignatius," are to be found—to the Trallians—to the Philadelphians—to the Smyrneans—to St. Polycarp? We don't find them in our Protestant Bible. What is the other little book you are now extracting from? Is it Butler's "Lives of the Saints?"

'Tis sad when you find people glorying in their shame, and this seems to be the case with reference to the parading of what they call a contradiction of the extract relative to the Archbishop of Canterbury holding out the hand of brotherly love to non-conformist clergymen. I fancy the world would believe they would have more to glory over had the extract been well founded. I gave it as I found it in an English paper. But what of Her Majesty the Queen and the Dean of Canterbury's grave offence of receiving communion at the hands of non-conformist clergymen? There was no "hoax" about that, but none of the "Defenders of the Faith" have said a word on the subject: surely they ought to be excommunicated.

We all understand that at the Reformation certain matters of faith were left in the Church to ease or pacify the minds of the masses; but can you show me that they have been put in practice in the Church of England until of late years, when they are attempted to be clandestinely introduced? The watchword of the Reformers was "Reason and Revelation."

"Cranmer" has been quoted against us by one writer, but his *final views* are well understood. He says, relative to the "Real Presence":—"My belief is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and the benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of His blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacrament; but all this I understand of the spiritual presence of which he saith: "I will be with you unto the world's end." Again, he says, "I say Christ is spiritually and by grace, in His supper, as He is where two or three are gathered together in His name—meaning that with both he is spiritually, and with neither corporally. The wayfaring man, though a fool, cannot err therein."

This is the doctrine we of the Reformed Church believe in, and is neither "transubstantiation" nor—as the Church of England catechism says—"the body and blood of Christ, which is *verily and indeed* taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

But, again, suppose for argument sake I admit what it is said the belief of the Reformers was, so to have really been. They were only men like ourselves, with the same passions, failings and weaknesses; and it is not claimed that they or the church which they founded were infallible, and it is very certain that these beliefs were not practised. I was born and brought up in the Church of England and certainly was never taught these doctrines, and there are thousands like me. It may be said then, what have we to complain of? We have this to complain of and object to, that they form part of the prayer book of the church which they should not do, but should be expunged; and that certain of the clergy are doing there

utmost
teach th
themsel

I t
assure
questio
nothing
interfer

A
Times,
say in
which
Church
dishone
in. W
they w
and th
io exac
of Eng

In
priests
as well
they d
Accord
We do
conscie
themse
which

O
not aff
we me
the he
will tr
broug
earlier

A
who d

I
the p
to do
recom
and l
too z
beara

we ar
taugh
with
faith

utmost to introduce these objectionable portions into practice and teach them to our children, and for no other purpose, but to make themselves important and gain power over the laity.

I thank "Backwoodsman" for his sympathy, but I would assure him I am in no *trouble* whatever, relative to the matter in question, my creed now is what it always has been, nothing more or nothing less, and we of the Reformed Church have no desire to interfere with the creed of others, if they will only leave us alone.

A writer on the church question who signs "Vigilans" in the *Times*, says, "As a churchman of the advanced school, allow me to say in reference to recent correspondence, that I admire the candour which prompts those who don't accept the plain doctrines of the Church of England, to leave her, the people who really act a *dishonest* part are those who disbelieve these doctrines and remain in. When the non-conformists went out in 1662 they did so because they were honest men who saw that the church was not Protestant, and that they must seek Protestantism if at all, outside"—the latter is exactly the grounds on which we have left the "Catholic Church of England."

In Bishop Lewis' printed address, he says, "There are bishops, priests and deacons to day who hold these disbeliefs and their livings as well. The laity in large numbers disbelieve a great deal that they ought to believe, and no one attempts to prevent them." According to "Vigilans," these parties are acting "*a dishonest part.*" We do not believe in two faiths in one church, we can respect the conscientious Roman Catholic, but we cannot respect those who call themselves "Priests" of the Church of England, and preach a faith which is not her faith and is not Protestant.

Outsiders may call us by any appellation they like, but it will not affect us in the slightest degree. We have taken a stand and we mean to stick to it, and we have no doubt as to our success with the help of God. There is room and plenty of work for us, and we will try to assimilate our church to the one in which we have been brought up, and the doctrine which we have been taught from our earliest years, and which we know to be Protestant.

Any who wish to join us we will be happy to receive, and those who desire to remain where they are we wish them God-speed.

I think the church matter has been sufficiently discussed at the present time, that all may understand the question who desire to do so. I, for one, retire from the scene, and I would respectfully recommend all advocates of the Reformed Church to do likewise, and let us endeavor to put in practice what we have perhaps been too zealously advocating, and perhaps not with that Christian forbearance and charity which the religion we profess inculcates.

The whole matter, to my mind, resolves itself into this—that we are standing up for a reasonable creed which we have been taught and believe in, and our opponents are fighting for a church with two creeds and two sets of clergy, each holding a different faith.

LUTHER II.

OTTAWA, 2nd April, 1874.

THE REFORMED CHURCH.

To the Editor of THE CITIZEN :—

DEAR SIR,—Permit me to draw the attention of the members of the various Episcopal Vestries, which meet this evening on church matters, to a book now in use in Sunday School in the Diocese of Toronto, and found in the Depository of this Diocese at Kingston, entitled "The Path of Holiness," edited by the Rev. T. T. Carter, Rector, Clower, England. It is almost a transcript of the Roman Catholic "Garden of the Soul," and contains instructions for

- 1. The use of the Ave Maria in all devotions.
- 2. Invocation of the Virgin Mary and Saints.
- 3. Seven Sacraments.
- 4. Unction of the Sick.
- 5. The Merit of Voluntary Poverty and Celibacy.
- 6. Prayer for the Dead.
- 7. The Confessional.
- 8. Ablutions in the Holy Communion.
- 9. Transubstantiation, or the Real Presence.
- 10. Making the Sign of the Cross.

I am not prepared to say that this book is in our city Sunday Schools, but if it is in the Church Depository at Kingston, the end of the wedge is in and with our Ritualistic clergy, it will soon be in use here.

As can be proved the book is given to the Sunday School scholars with the strict injunction that they are not to make their parents aware that they have it. What nice men to be the instructors of our children and have the care of their souls. If parents allow their children to be taught by books of this character, the result must be evident to all, that the children will be false to the faith of their fathers.

I have also in my possession a notice of excommunication to a lady in this Diocese for non-attendance at Church, from which she absented herself for good reasons. The notice gives the lady one month to retrace her steps, conform to the rites and ceremonies of the church, otherwise her name to be sent to the Bishop as excommunicated, and she is to be denied Christian burial should she die. Are the members of the Church of England asleep when they allow such trash to be taught in Sunday Schools and this mummerly of excommunication practised in their very midst.

SENEX.

OTTAWA, April 6th, 1874.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

To the RT. REV. DR. LEWIS, Bishop of Ontario.

DEAR SIR,—An insignificant correspondent of the *Times* has taken exception to the title by which I address you, and perhaps its too frequent repetition. I would however assure you that I have used the title only from a feeling of respect to the position you hold,

and per
because
usually

The
answer
is done
your di
Episcop
not the

W
deprive
told th

"Chur
vestry
unity o

"Old
We ha
hear a

at the
of HER

thus a
idea, a
such i

wome
Praye

of the
incline

provi
were
the ca

trine
Confes
Sunda

Y
Book
at the

made
posed

it cor
certa
not a

much
the
tures
lariz

inclu
mod
thro
qual

and personally towards you as an educated gentleman, and further, because it is the term by which all "Bishops of the Church" are usually addressed.

The question may be raised why I address you at all; my answer is simply, that I have a perfect right to do so, so long as it is done respectfully, inasmuch as you have not deemed it beneath your dignity both to speak and write publicly of "The Reformed Episcopal Church," its Bishops, Clergy, Laity and doctrine, in not the most complimentary manner.

Whilst we are looked upon by your Lordship as "Schismatics deprived of all the privileges and rights of the Church," and are told that "in some mysterious manner" we still believe ourselves "Churchmen," it would appear from the reports of the various vestry meetings on Easter Monday in this city, that peace, love and unity does not altogether exist among those who remain in the "Old Church," and it is very evident they are not all of one faith. We have "The Church" paraded before us on all occasions. We hear and read of "the great sorrow and distress of THE CHURCH," at the "waywardness of her children," &c. What is the meaning of HER sorrow and distress? Who and what is SHE whose grief is thus asserted, and whose privileges we are deprived of? Simply an idea, a formless vision. There is no such person, and there is no such institution apart from individual living Christian men and women, and the Governments which authorized the use of the Prayer Book. We are admonished to be guided by "the teaching of the Church" and its definition of the Holy Bible, one might feel inclined perhaps to accede in some degree to the latter proposition, provided that it could be shown that even the Clergy of THE CHURCH were of one mind on it, but it is notorious that the very reverse is the case, and you find the clergy preaching the most opposite doctrine from the same text. Let us take for example the subject of Confession and Absolution forming a portion of your sermon last Sunday fortnight.

Your Lordship referred to the three Confessions in the Prayer Book. The General Confession, the Confession for Communion, and at the Visitation of the Sick. By the report of the Press you are made to state that at the General Confession individuals are supposed to particularize their sins. This is very doubtful, indeed, but it conveys the idea that there is necessity for particularizing, and certainly the time occupied in making the General Confession will not admit of the Calendar of Sins being very long, nor will there be much time for bemoaning over any particular sin. We believe that the Almighty knows and sees the innermost thoughts of his creatures, and no particularizing is requisite. There was no particularizing when the Publican said, "God be merciful to me a sinner."

Touching the "Communion Confession," which is special and includes ABSOLUTION, you are made to say, "you wished to God this mode would come more in vogue, for many who now stay away through ignorance, would get rid of their doubts, and learn the true qualifications for partaking of the Sacrament." The Confession and

Absolution at the Visitation of the Sick is of a more special and stronger character, but in both cases we find the Clergy taking the initiatory step. Your Lordship strongly recommends the Communion Confession and Absolution, and the Prayer of Absolution in the Visitation of the Sick is prefaced by the words "Here shall the sick man be moved to make a special confession of his sins, &c." The difference your Lordship draws between this and the "Romish doctrine" is that the one is voluntary and the other compulsory—certainly a distinction without great difference when we reflect that several hundred clergymen of the Church of England are working on the most sensitive consciences to which they have access, telling them they are excommunicated if they do not go to confession and receive absolution from some Episcopally ordained Minister. Here they are exercising a spiritual terrorism which almost amounts to compulsion, for they wind up by impressing on the minds of their people that by their own acts they shut themselves out from the Communion of Saints and are dead in their sins, though remaining apparently living members of the one visible church.

From your Lordship's remarks one cannot come to any other conclusion but that you approve of Confession when voluntary on the part of the penitent, and of course believe that the Clergy of the Church of England have the power to absolve or retain sin as successors to the Apostles. But your Lordship's creed is of a milder form than that of the celebrated 483 clergymen who signed an address to the Bishops, asking them among other novelties to institute a regular order of "Confessors" for absolving the members of the English Church from their sins. The Bishops did not accede to their memorial, but we have the fact staring us in the face that at that period 483 Ministers of the Church entertained such extreme views, and we have no reason to believe they are diminished, judging from the audacity with which they put forward their views. Witness the following notice issued for the direction of persons in the habit of confessing to the Priests of a Church in the heart of London, and under the supervision of the Bishop of London.

"SAINT ALBAN THE MARTYR, HOLBORN."

"A Priest will attend in the Sacristy to hear confessions, at the following times:—

Wednesday—10 a.m. to 12.30; 2.30 to 7.45; and after evening service, for any who may desire it.

Friday—2 to 6 p.m.; for women only.

Saturday—10 a.m. to 12.30, for any one; 2.30 to 6 p.m., for men only; 6 to 7.45, for girls only; after evening service for any one.

Such is a specimen of the practice of the Church, whose "rites and privileges" we poor "Schismatics" are to be deprived of. In your printed address your Lordship says, "I feel certain the basis of the Church of England will never be narrowed. No branch of Christ's Church interferes so little with the religious consciousness of individuals." The basis certainly requires to be broad to admit

of such practices and notices as I have cited; and religious consciousness certainly is not interfered with when we see such notices stuck up, under the very nose of the Archbishop of Canterbury. And according to your Lordship's own admission there are Bishops, Priests and Deacons in the Church who do not believe in practising any such doctrine.

We know that the Apostles were inspired men, and the power given them to absolve from sin, &c.; but we do not and cannot believe that their mantle has fallen upon successors with any such power. We know it is asserted that unless the Apostolic succession be preserved, there is no Priest, no Sacrifice, no Sacrament, indeed no Church. Alas poor Nonconformists! According to this doctrine Salvation depends upon the reception of the Sacraments administered by a Priest who has received the Holy Ghost from a Bishop, who received the same Holy Spirit in direct succession from the Apostles. Now it is to be presumed that all the Clergy of the Church of England are not exactly Saints; many will recollect only some short time back the case of the Rev. Dr. Ward, a man of high literary endowments, who so brutally murdered his wife and concealed her body in a closet. He was tried and sentenced to be hanged, and would have been but for the "Cloth," and is now working out his commuted sentence of penal servitude for life, and there are many other successors to the Apostles in the same category. Can we therefore believe that Almighty God confers upon such men the Holy Ghost, and gives them the keys of Heaven and Hell, empowering them to forgive and retain sins. Does he bind himself to ratify the acts of such men? We have been told that we of the "Reformed Church" are of "doubtful education." Well, if a higher education would lead us to believe such blasphemy as this, we prefer to be of the "doubtfully educated" class. Three hundred years ago men rejected such doctrine, and were burnt at the stake, now they advocate them and such like, and officiate as ministers in the Protestant Episcopal Church of England. In fact, it is nothing more or less than mortal men usurping one of the greatest attributes of the Almighty, mercy and forgiveness, and blasphemy is not too strong to apply to it.

Who can undertake to say that this Apostolic link has not been broken and the sacramental virtue gone. Amidst the numerous corruptions of doctrine and practice and gross superstitions that crept in during the "dark ages" are found recorded descriptions of the most profound ignorance and profligacy of life of many of the clergy, and also of great irregularities in respect to discipline and form, mere children consecrated as Bishops, and men officiating who scarcely knew their letters—prelates expelled, and others put in their place by violence—illiterate and profligate laymen and habitual drunkards admitted to holy orders, and in short, the prevalence of every kind of disorder and reckless disregard of the decency which the Apostle enjoins. So says Dr. Whately, late Archbishop of Dublin.

I note your Lordship's remarks on Transubstantiation, Consubstantiation, and what you state to be the belief of the Church of England on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Your Lordship quotes the 28th Article of the Church of England in support of the same, which, to a certain extent, is good, but what comes of the teaching of children the Catechism of the Church as found in the Book of Common Prayer, wherein it expressly states "The Body and Blood of Christ which is verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The children are taught this at Sunday School, if we are to judge from the "Path of Holiness" found in the Sunday School Library of Christ's Church here at Easter, and in use in the Diocese of Toronto. How did this Roman Catholic "Garden of the Soul" find its way into the library? Somebody must have been instrumental in introducing it there, and with an object; and whose duty is it, my Lord, to see that they are not in many other Sunday School libraries in the Diocese, as is confidently stated to be the case? There must be a "Wolf in Sheep's clothing" somewhere. The Saviour says, "While men slept, his enemy came, and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. But when the blade was sprung up and brought forth fruit, there appeared the tares also."

'Tis beyond a doubt that there are two contending systems in the English Church, the Protestant and the Priestly. The doctrine of Ritualism, under the Priestly system, is that "Christ is still present in His Church, verily and indeed, in the Sacrament of the Altar, very God, very man. That as he is both God and man—as these two natures are for ever joined in His one person—His Godhead must be wherover His body is, and therefore He is to be worshipped in His Sacrament."

This is very far from Protestant doctrine. Still it is the belief of hundreds of the clergy of the Church of England, and is spreading daily among the laity through the teaching of Ritualistic ministers. The Church Association of the Diocese of Toronto are doing good work, and using every endeavour to bring influence to bear on the Synod to stop those innovations, but I am afraid they will not succeed, it has been tried repeatedly and without effect.

There will then be but one course left for those who have the moral courage to do so: viz., to come out from a Church where such un-Protestant doctrines and practices exist, and join a Church where they can worship the Almighty as their fathers did, and where no priest stands between man and his Maker.

You have been pleased, my Lord, to state that you disapprove of the Ritualistic practices in your Diocese, and have used all means in your power to suppress them. I do not pretend to know what the power of a Bishop is in such matters, but the Reformers of old found means to put a stop to similar practices, and the same way is open to Your Lordship. But all Bishops do not think alike as to their powers, especially when it is to defend Ritualism. Of this we have a case in point at Victoria, British Columbia, lately.

In December, 1872, the new cathedral was consecrated, and the Dean invited the Archdeacon of Vancouver to preach on the occasion. To the horror and astonishment of the Dean and many of the congregation, the Archdeacon's sermon was in support of Ritualism. At its close, the Dean, taken aback by the course pursued, stood up and denounced the Archdeacon and his doctrine, telling him he had violated the law of the Church, the law of the land, and the law of God in the Scriptures—and which received the approbation of a large portion of the congregation. But it did not meet the views of the Bishop of Columbia, who addressed the Dean a long letter of censure, winding up as follows: "As your Bishop, then, I censure you for your conduct on Thursday, the 5th day of December, 1872, and I admonish you to be more careful in future."

But not one word of censure or disapprobation of the Archdeacon's Ritualistic sermon on so important an occasion as the consecration of a Cathedral.

Proper thinking people believe than Dean Cridge was correct in applying the antidote the moment the poison was administered, and it showed the prompting of an honest Protestant heart, but the Bishop objected to time and place, according to some musty old rule of ecclesiastical law.

There is one point I ought to refer to in conclusion. Your Lordship has referred to the fact that we do not call our Church "The Protestant Reformed Episcopal Church." This we deem quite unnecessary, inasmuch as none will doubt our Protestantism. We have left the "Episcopal Church of Canada" on account of its *unprotestant* doctrine, teaching and practices, and its sacerdotalism and Romanizing tendencies. We do not believe in a Church with one portion of its clergy preaching Protestantism and another portion holding up "Birmingham," ware in the shape of Ritualism, a miserable imitation of Roman Catholicism.

In your Lordship's printed address you state "that it is just possible that we may be disappointed in the result of this schismatical attempt * * * * and may suffer a dangerous downfall into Romanism or Infidelity." Don't be anxious on that score, My Lord; we will endeavour to avoid both, but the remark does not come well from a Bishop of a Diocese, where one of his shining lights, in the shape of a Ritualistic Priest officiating in this very city, has so lately left the Church and been received into the Roman Catholic communion. It would almost appear that there was more danger in your own house than ours, and if we are to judge of the action now being taken by the Orange Society, they seem to be of that opinion also.

I have the honor to be,
Your Lordship's obd't Servant,

SENEX.

THE REFORMED EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

DEAR SIR,—As stated in my last letter, I did not intend again to enter the arena, but finding maligners of the Reformed Church are getting bold on our silence, I again take up my pen to let them know that we are both prepared and able to defend our position and refute their infamous calumnies.

One of our opponents some short time back who stated he was in the habit of reading the "English papers," was kind enough to give the public an extract from an English paper to prove, as he vaunted, that what had been advanced by us regarding the Archbishop of Canterbury's opinion of Nonconformists was nothing but a "hoax." Well to my mind it has not yet been proved a "hoax" and if the Archbishop would condescend to speak for himself in the matter, I feel satisfied he would endorse the sentiments we attributed to him, at all events *he* has not denied them. They were that of a true Christian gentleman which we believe Dr. Tait to be, and not that of a Ritualistic Jesuit Priest, which we are sometimes obliged to listen to or read.

I sometimes read the "English Papers" also, and I have now one before me, "The Church Times" of the 2nd ultimo, a High Church paper published in London, an organ of the Church of England, and a disgrace to any Church that would own it as such.

I find in it part of a communication from an "Occasional Correspondent" from this city, and a beautiful production it certainly is. Who he is we know not, but his production would bring a blush to the face of the mother who bore him. He is no layman, for I do not believe there is a layman of the Church to be found in Ottawa who would so far forget his manliness as to endeavour to throw a stain on the character of an estimable lady, the wife of a clergyman; or stigmatize his fellow laymen, a whole congregation of our most respectable citizens as this traducer has done. Referring to the arrival of Dr. Gallagher in this city, this wretch says, "By way of blowing the trumpet in the New Zion, the Committee invited the heroic ex-Bishop (coadjutor) of Kentucky to visit Canada and rally his adherents. Domestic circumstances prevented his acceding to this request, and he sent in his place one of the seven Schismatical Priests who have flocked to his standard. Accordingly the Rev. Mason Gallagher, D.D., of New York, accompanied by his lady was met at Prescott by an Emissary of the Sect, and at the Ottawa Station by the Committee, who accompanied him and her to the principal hotel of the city."

Now I would appeal to any one having the smallest pretensions to the name of a gentleman to say if the quotation I have given must not have emanated from a black heart, and a mean, low grovelling mind. Cannot the subject in question be discussed without descending to low personalities unworthy of a gentleman. What had this lady in question done that she should be dragged into the slime which this traducer seems to wallow in. Does he know (for he is among us to-day) that a more estimable and amiable person never set her foot in this city, and that she is connected with some of the most respect-

able fa
slander
or noti
Bu
the be
congre
"

" firm
" an ac
" expl
" best
" foun
" peop
" ant,
" upho
" over
" an
" Cath
" thre
" schi
" M

your p
Chape
of the
tation
You
" schi
" M

layma
apt so
but I
Chnr
thing
speci
plain
sanct
woul
snak
keep

the C
joine
" wh
" sm
" ne
" ca

's su
from
blas

able families in the city. But he wrote under the feeling that all slanderers do, viz., that perhaps his letter would never be seen here or noticed.

But let me give another quotation from this worthy's epistle for the benefit of His Lordship, Bishop Lewis, and the members of his congregation:—

"The Bishop of Ontario, Dr. John Travers Lewis, has taken a firm stand against the heresy, and delivered on the 22nd February an address which must have startled his congregation. It may be explained that Dr. Lewis, himself a High Churchman, and the best of our Canadian Prelates, in removing his chair to Ottawa, found in his Chapel a body of pronounced "Evangelists," these people being mostly of the 'Bourgeois gentilhomme' type, ignorant, bitter, and purse-proud, refuse to abandon their pew system, uphold a service which it is a penance to attend, and tyrannize over their Curate as they wish to do over their Bishop. To such an audience, untrained, I regret to say, in the rudiments of Catholic orthodoxy, because refusing to listen, and constantly threatening defection, he has unfolded the fact that union with schism is incompatible with continuance in our communion."

My Lord Bishop and Curate, how do you like the picture of your position and congregation? And gentlemen of the "Bishop's Chapel," how do you like the character given you by this maligners of the "Reformed Church," this attempted traducer of ladies' reputation, and this defender of the faith of the Church of England? You seem certainly a happy family after having got rid of the "schismatics of doubtful reputation."

Now who is this "Occasional Correspondent? Certainly not a layman. Layman do not talk of "our communion," and are not apt so frequently to quote French and Latin as this worthy does, but I forget, Bishop Lewis is stated to have said the members of the Church of England, as a rule, were "educated gentlemen," or something to that effect, perhaps this is one of the type, and a fine specimen he truly is. But the whole style of the communication plainly exhibits the "cloth" he wears; one of your sneaking, meek, sanctified hypocrites, who, under the garb of a Protestant minister, would poison the Church which he is sworn to uphold, who, like a snake, spits out his venom on the passer-by, and at the same time keeps himself concealed.

One more quotation, and I am done with this worthy son of the Church. Referring to those who have left the "Church" and joined the Reformed Church, he says, "Could all of it be drained, at whatever cost of temporary weakness, the Canadian Church, long smitten with the *Leprosy of Protestantism*, would become as she never yet has been '*Pulchra ut luna, electa ut sol, terribilis ut castrorum acies ordinata.*'"

The above scarcely needs comment—in fact the quotation itself is sufficient ground for any properthinking Protestant to come out from a Church calling itself Protestant, and supporting such infamous blasphemy.

OTTAWA, May 8th, 1874.

LUTHER II.

To the Laity of the Church of England in Canada.

The foregoing letters have been published in the press of this city and universally warmly approved of by the Protestant Community, excepting, as a matter of course, the High Church or Ritualistic members of the church, to whom they are gall and wormwood.

They are now published in the present form for more general circulation, under the hope that they will be read by many who have not had the opportunity of seeing the Ottawa papers.

We, of the Reformed Episcopal Church, are not ashamed of our colors, and are quite prepared to defend them in every respect. They are published at this particular time, more especially for the perusal of the Lay Delegates to the Episcopal Synods now about to meet, under the hope that they will carefully study them and take such a stand as will show their brother Churchmen that they are not ashamed of being called Protestants, but proud of it, and that they are determined to root out from the much loved church of our fathers, all Romanizing tendencies, teaching, and practises, and hail her as the Protestant Church of England.

As will be seen by one of the letters, a correspondent from here to the "London (England) Church Times," (and believed to be a clergyman of this city) writes of the Church of England here as being afflicted with the "Leprosy of Protestantism." Surely there must be something wrong in the church, when in the 19th century we find a member of the Protestant Church of England using such language and publishing it to the world.

The letters herewith speak for themselves, and cover almost every point in dispute in the church, and refer particularly to the doctrine now taught openly by many of the clergy, viz., *Auricular Confession, absolution by the Priest, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Communion, regeneration by baptism, and the Apostolic Succession*, or the Clergy of the Church assuming that they are the *divinely inspired* successors of the Apostles in a direct line, all of which we of the Reformed Episcopal Church repudiate as unprotestant, being little short of blasphemy, and tending to lead the laity, with railroad speed, to the Church of Rome (where one of the clergy in this city has so lately gone), and we feel that the clergy who advocate such doctrine as the power of absolving or retaining sin are usurping one of the highest attributes of Almighty God, viz., Mercy and forgiveness, for we believe no one can forgive sin but God, and we do not believe He has delegated that power to *frail mortal man*.

There is not one of the clergy who would dare to promulgate such doctrine from his pulpit, but they teach it, and much worse in our Sunday Schools, and among the weak-minded members of the church *privately*, their whole aim is "Priestcraft!" or to get power over the laity whom they desire to lead or rule, not only in things spiritual, but temporal also.

There are one or two points not referred to in these letters which we wish especially to draw attention to. In the first place,

we wo
return
made
firmat
things
imposi
Ghost;
firmat

T
"

these
unto t

T

regen
Bisho
their
under
a cert
and
took

we a
remo
the c
spoon
to en
they
the G
their
savo

and
beca
Ritu
that
emp
last
to s
yet
Eas
ing
pos
Pri
Rit
bod
from
rec
"pa
me
ing
sor

we would refer to a Confirmation tour Bishop Lewis has just returned from, up the Ottawa Valley, accompanied by his newly-made *Venerable* Archdeacon Lauder. At Pembroke, after the Confirmation Service, the Archdeacon preached, and, among other things, told the congregation that beyond a doubt that by the imposition of the Bishop's hands *the candidates had received The Holy Ghost*; but this is not to be wondered at when we read in the Confirmation Service in the Prayer Book as follows:—

The Bishop.—Let us pray:

“Almighty and everlasting God who has vouchsafed to *regenerate* these thy servants by water and the Holy Ghost, and hast given unto them forgiveness of all their sins.”

There is no half measure here; no prayer that they may be regenerated and their sins forgiven, but a clear declaration by the Bishop that the candidates for confirmation are regenerate and all their sins forgiven. Is this Priestcraft, or cant; or what is it? We understand Confirmation to be an Ordinance of the Church, that at a certain age persons who have been baptized shall come forward and assume the responsibility which their Godfather's, &c., took for them at their baptism, and nothing more—and we are strongly of the opinion that the whole thing wants remodelling. What do our Godfathers and Godmothers do for the children they stand sponsors for, just give them a silver spoon or knife and fork, and there their duty and attention seems to end—then again many men and women are not confirmed until they have obtained mature years—surely it is not to be argued that the Godfathers and Godmothers are responsible until such time as their worthy Godchildren choose to relieve them, the whole of this savours strongly of Priestly manufacture which it no doubt is.

It may be argued, why have we not remained in the church and endeavour to get the abuses we complain of reformed, simply because we are tired of trying to do so, and we find these abuses and Ritualistic practices increasing instead of diminishing, and we find that even the word of Bishops are not to be depended on. Thus exemplified—at the Vestry meeting at the Bishop's chapel in this city last Easter Monday the Bishop stated that he had done all he could to suppress Ritualism in his Diocese, and would continue to do so, yet in the face of this declaration His Lordship has thought fit since Easter to make Mr. Lauder his Archdeacon, and Dr. Jones Examining Chaplain, Canon, &c., of his Cathedral, thus advancing to high positions in the church, two of the most notorious Ritualistic Priests in the Diocese, this is certainly an odd way of suppressing Ritualism, and again we hold we are perfectly correct in leaving a body whose principles and doings we disapprove. “Come ye out from among them and be ye *separate* saith the Lord and I will receive you.” Again St. Paul tells Timothy that he should not be “partaker of other men's sins,” and is not man a partaker of other men's offences against Christ, who sets them forward in propogating their errors by his union with them; and does not he who consorts in every way with teachers of error, and gives his substance

to sustain their churches, sends delegates to their Synods, helps to pay the expenses of such assemblies, pays to sustain Ritualistic Bishops, Priests: is he not a partaker of the guilt of such doings, and necessarily offensive to the Almighty and injurious to his fellow-man; and, we have left the old church simply because she has departed from the faith and gone after another Gospel, to the subversion of the souls of the people and to the dishonor of the Saviour.

On the occasion of the absence from the City of our own Clergyman some few weeks ago, we availed ourselves of the kind services of the Rev. Mr. Hunter of the Methodist Church and the Rev. Mr. Moore of the Presbyterian Church, who conducted our service morning and evening in the most satisfactory manner, we felt under deep obligation to these gentlemen for their ready acquiescence in our request, and it was a matter of great satisfaction to all connected that an Episcopal Church was established which recognized the ministrations of the Clergy of all other Protestant denominations, and welcomed them to their pulpit. So far so good, but in a day or two afterwards we were favoured through the press with a communication from some scribbler referring to the great satisfaction and pride it must have been to the gentlemen named in being permitted to occupy the Pulpit in an Episcopal Church where the "successors to the Apostles" officiated. We know both these Clergymen felt much pleasure and satisfaction in officiating in our Church, but we are equally certain they would not feel their reputation in any way improved by occupying the pulpits heretofore held by some of the "successors of the Apostles" in the old church, but the contrary: we have this Apostolic Succession shoved under our noses *ad nauseam*, and for further light as to what some of them have been let us refer to the eighteenth century, and what do we find in the Fleet Prison, London? Why! that not less than fifty Church of England clergymen, "Successors to the Apostles," and a Bishop were confined there at one time, leading the most dissolute and disgraceful lives, and living by solemnizing marriages at all prices from half a crown to a guinea. The advertisements of some of the leading members of this fraternity speak for themselves:—"Peter Symson informed the public that he acted by Royal authority; that he had been "educated at the University of Cambridge," and was "late chaplain to a nobleman," married couples in a room furnished with chair, cushions and proper conveniences. In a single year he married 2,200 couples. John Lundo, another, was "a regular bred clergyman," a gentleman who was lately Chaplain on board one of Her Majesty's ships of war, &c., who was above committing those little mean actions that some men impose on people, everything would be conducted with the utmost decency and regularity such as shall always be supported by Law and Equity." Such is a sample of the men who form a portion of the links in the chain of Apostolic Succession, and who the clergy of to-day have so much reason to be proud of as their successors, these are the *divinely inspired* men who

presume to turn up their noses at clergymen of other denominations, these are the "educated gentlemen"—when will the people of the Church of England get their eyes opened?

We have with us in union and sympathy many of the Orange body, and we find some of the lodges have taken action as against Ritualism, but we are more than surprised they they have not long ago had their eyes opened to the fact that many of the leading officers of the order are the warmest supporters of the Ritualistic party, and the strongest opponents of the Reformed Church. They are Political Orangemen who have joined the order to advance their own personal interests and nothing else, they don't believe in the rank and file thinking for themselves or they would lose their influence over them, and thus lose their political influence. The Orange institution was established, as we believe, for the defence and protection of the Protestant faith, and as it is now handled, it is used by designing leaders to forward their political interests and support High Church Ritualism.

We have our church here firmly established and increasing daily. We have a Clergyman of our own, not a Yankee as some of our enemies are pleased to circulate, but a good sound Irishman. We shall have a handsome church ready for occupation in the Fall, and we shall be able to shew Bishop Lewis that we are not the contemptable body he would have the public believe.

LUTHER II.

OTTAWA, 12th June, 1874.



