

the points upon which further discussion is requested are two in number.

The first touches our use of the term of Ordination. After approving the distinction made in my former article between the New Testament and the popular, present day use of the word ordain, the editor enquires: "But is it quite correct to say that "ordination," as we use the word, "signifies the public ceremony in which a candidate is set apart for sacred service by the laying on of hands?" It is true that the public ceremony is signified, but is not appointment also signified, in the term "ordination" as we use it? The church elects its candidate for ordination, but subject to the advice of a council representing the sister churches, and if that advice is not favorable, there is no appointment—no ordination. The essential thing to ordination is that the voice of the council coincide with the voice of the church."

Now if I correctly interpret the above, the disagreement between the editor and myself is very slight, if indeed, there is any disagreement. The public ceremony which we call ordination, does of course imply previous action on the part of the church in calling the council and in recommending its candidate for denominational recognition. In that sense and to that extent, ordination as we use the term, "signifies" appointment. The legitimate work of the council, however, is or should be, not to confirm an "appointment" or "election" of the church, but to confer its own recognition upon the candidate. All appointments of the church stand valid until revoked by the church. This is not only "good Baptist doctrine," but good New Testament doctrine as well. The question of the editor, in which election by the church is associated with the laying on of hands by a council, serves as an occasion to emphasize again the necessity of keeping before us the fact that scripturally the word "ordain" means to elect to office. In strict speech a church ordains every time it elects a person to office, and with such action councils have nothing to do.

The second question is of more importance. The editor writes: "To the question, Who is competent to elect the minister—that is, to ordain in the New Testament sense—Mr. Freeman replies, "That is unquestionably the inalienable right of the individual, local church." This is good Baptist doctrine certainly, but the question will naturally occur to some readers—How then is it that in all the passages cited from the New Testament concerning the ordination of ministers in the church, it is not the church which 'ordains'?"

To this I reply, that the six passages cited to show the meaning of the word "ordain," there is but one in which the clear reference is to "the ordination of ministers in the church" and in that one it is the church which ordains. That one clear reference is found in Acts 14:23: "When they had ordained (cheironotesantes) them elders in every church." To the casual reader of the English version it might appear as though Paul and Barnabas had elected these elders independently and on their own authority. But the original, cheironotesantes, proves to the contrary. That word means, "constituted by vote," "elected by show of hands." Paul and Barnabas evidently brought on the elections; they may have served respectively, as chairman and secretary of the meetings, but "in every church" the election was by voting with the uplifted hand. To my mind this establishes the fact, that in the whole circle of churches from Lystra to Antioch, each individual church did elect, appoint, ordain its elders.

In another of the passages quoted there is a probable though not unmistakable reference to "the ordination of ministers in the church." In Titus 1:5, Paul writes "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain—(revised version "appoint") *Katastates*—elders in every city, as I gave thee charge." If there were churches "in every city," then the reference is once more to the ordination of the ministers in the churches. In this case what are we to infer concerning the ordination? The original word here is not so definite as in the former instance, as it simply affirms the result of an action without indicating the method of procedure. But since Titus acted under Paul's instruction in this matter, it is not to be inferred that throughout the cities of Crete as formerly in the churches of Asia Minor, the election was made by vote of the church?

Of the passages cited these are all that refer to the ordination of ministers in the church. The quotations were given not simply to show that in the strict sense of the word the church ordains its ministers, though the above passages do show that—but to support the assertion "that the word "ordain" as found in the New Testament always denotes an election to office by the person or persons competent to make the election." Of the six passages, three refer to the ordination of Apostles by the Lord Himself, and one to the ordination of Jesus by the Father, to the judgeship of the world.

There are other phases of this question of ordination upon which I should like to speak. But as there are others to be heard from, and as I have dealt with the points suggested by the editor, I shall leave the discussion to be continued by the brethren.

J. D. FREEMAN.

The Ordination Question Again.

It is to be hoped that the discussion of this subject will lead to some measure of reform, in those points in which our practice is open to valid objection. There are still some things to be said, and perhaps a layman may be permitted to say a few of them.

My first point is doctrinal. It is quite generally taken for granted in our denomination that the principle upon which our established practice is based is drawn from the New Testament, and is the only scriptural principle. It is unscriptural, unapostolical, and therefore unapostolic. We are told for the ordaining power to be invested anywhere but in the church—the local church. But where is the proof? There are, I think, only about ten passages which can fairly be considered as referring to or bearing upon the question: viz: Acts 1:22, 23—6:3, 6;—13:3, 14; 23—18:7;—1 Tim. 2:7;—4:14;—5:22;—2 Tim. 1:21;—Titus 1:5. Which of these teaches that the pastors or elders were ordained—set apart by the laying on of hands—by the authority of a local church?

In Acts 1:15-26, the church, put forward two men—Joseph and Matthias—the latter of whom was selected by lot, and "became" a witness and an apostle.

In Acts 6, "the multitude of the disciples," chose seven men for a special service, upon whom the apostles laid their hands.

In Acts 14:23, we read that the apostles Paul and Barnabas "appointed for them elders in every church,"—the "them" meaning the disciples gathered during their missionary tour. The Greek word here correctly translated "appointed," or in the common version "ordained," is one which commonly means to elect by "a show of hands," in which sense probably it is used in 2 Cor. 8:19. In the latter passage it expresses the voting of the church; in the former it indicates the authoritative action of the apostles.

We may prove it to be wise or expedient or the reverse, to leave the ordaining power theoretically with the church; but can we prove it scriptural or unscriptural.

My second point is, perhaps, historical. In most cases of ordination in these provinces, the final decision to proceed to ordination, as well as the formal ceremony, is practically the act of the council and not of the church. Will any one say that the following is not the usual course? (1) The Council is called, and convenes at the headquarters of the church, to consider the propriety of setting apart Brother A, to the ministry. (2) The council satisfies itself of the regularity and harmony of the church's action. (3) The Council satisfies itself of the fitness or unfitness of the candidate. (4) The Council votes for or against the ordination. (5) The Council, when the vote is affirmative, without any further vote or action of the church, proceeds to arrange for the ceremonial observances, and the ministers or elders present ordain Bro. A. "in due and ancient form."

My third point is practical. A dozen churches may be invited to send each its pastor and two other delegates "to sit in council." Perhaps four pastors and eight lay delegates (often fewer) attend the council. These may or may not embody a fair representation of the wisdom of the churches. Why is it that so few attend? Partly because few brethren can afford to leave their home and their work to travel from ten to fifty miles on business of this nature, at their own expense. Is it right to expect them to do so? If the Association were made the Council this difficulty would disappear.

Previous to 1877 ordinations usually took place at the Association. What harm would result from reviving the practice?

From Halifax.

The Inspector of licenses of Halifax, and the city council persist in granting licenses to sell strong drink nearer than one hundred feet of a church, a school house and a railroad. One hundred and one feet and the law protects the vender. Cut off a foot, and the law condemns. To be too near a church building, the business is injurious to Christians. To be too near a railroad it is dangerous to customers. The Jewish synagogue, said a certain liquor dealer, is not a place of worship. The judge corrected this notion. He held the opposite opinion. Now some temperance people want the distance two hundred feet. Liquor has a long range and can shoot with phenomenal precision. The good wines of France, have brought men and women down in Nova Scotia. Negroes by the hundred in Africa have fallen by the sharp shooters of Bedford, Mass. The distance between churches and all human habitations must be increased to 24,000 miles before the people will be safe.

The law and order league, a voluntary association composed of such men as B. H. Eaton, A. M. Bell and J. C. MacIntosh asked the legislature for incorporation to enable them to enforce city laws against ill-famed dwellings, gambling and the liquor trade. When island revenue or customs laws are broken, men on high salary tramp over the provinces to find out and punish the law breakers; but laws against the vices of intemperance, immorality, and gambling can be violated and society find no government officials after the culprits. More than this, when gentlemen of high standing and much engaged with their own business, offer to give their time and risk the consequences of rum-revenge, both the House of Assembly and the Legislative Council say, gentlemen, raise \$1,000 to protect these men and women in a matter of money, if a case at law should go against you. Why not grant the Law and Order League \$500 to be used in legal processes, honestly, discreetly, if necessary? No is the answer and that no smells of rum. The Halifax Law and Order League can proceed with their benevolent work, if they will raise \$1,000 to protect busses who keep houses of perdition, and rascals who keep dens of the devil, and both men and women who sell illegally, "the devil in solution."

My dear friends, said Mr. Laurier, on behalf of his political party, help us out of the shadow into the sunshine, and we won't mock you with royal commissions. We will give you prohibition if the country wants it. A plebiscite will settle it. Majority too small! Again prohibition is betrayed with a kiss, a French kiss this time, not Canadian French, but Continental French. Plebiscite is a French method of manufacturing law. Liberty and power, lodged in the units of the nation, are English. The methods of securing the one and exercising the other have been given us by the old land. But

they are judged too slow for constituencies on fire with American notions. Let us have the methods of the volatile Celts south of the English channel. We accepted it. It has fooled us. We are green with chagrin. A third party was a preceding cry. That, too, mocked us. To the winds with the plebiscites and third parties, and back to the old English methods through which liberty and wholesome laws were obtained. Petition, tirelessly, continuously pledge candidates for the House of Commons, follow them up, hold them to their bargains, till the Commons is taken by storm. Enough of chasing Jack-with-his-lantern-plebiscites, third parties, etc.

The public has been called in to meet the stockholders of the Book Room. 400 Sunday Schools have dealt with the Society. In the fifteen years of the life of the Book Room it has sold \$148,290.49 worth of books, etc. Four years of colportage has been done. Hymnals to the number of 26,179 have been sold. Vast numbers of lesson helps and papers have passed through the Rooms to the people. As the work has been benevolent and denominational it was resolved at the last meeting to open up the work to the denomination and make it wholly benevolent. Stocks and dividends to stockholders will be heard of no more. Appeals will be made for money to increase the business on its new basis.

Pendeumis, referred to in my last report, is still at work. He seems to want to reform the churches. Bishop Courtney is reported to have noticed his labors in a sermon last Sunday at St. Paul's. Pendeumis had described a society girl preparing in Lent for confirmation. You will not feel like going into the world of gayety again, was asked of the girl? O, I don't think it involves anything like that. It does not, says the pungent writer. Those anointed hands laid on the heads of beautiful girls is only a pretty moral picture. The Bishop is reported as saying in reply to this, "Our religion involves as much to each individual as it did in the days of the apostles. "But," says the eloquent bishop, "is your idea of giving up the world to be understood to be not going to a ball, or a theatre, or a card party, or a lunch, or an afternoon tea? That," said his lordship, "is not my idea of giving up the world." The same good Bishop at the beginning of Lent thought that the trees should be eschewed during its season, but pipes, wine and cigars were all right in moderation. Now balls, dances and card parties are added. Sinners will be much pleased with this, saints not.

Rev. G. A. Lawson is at Isaacs Harbor for a season. Rev. A. C. Chute is examining classes at Horton. Rev. W. E. Hall is looking for a ship to take him to Port Hillford.

You should have had a full report of what the College governors did last week. Well they resolved, after reluctantly accepting Miss True's resignation, whose popularity is in all the churches, that they would let a good man try his hand at the business. A whole day was given to the examination of the whole question. Late at night a decision was reached. Drs. Trotter, Sawyer, Saunders, C. W. Roscoe, G. R. Halsey, B. H. Eaton and Rev. A. Cohoon were appointed a committee to nominate a male principal and a woman vice principal and report next June. Drs. Trotter and Sawyer advocated the change. REPORTER.

DEAR EDITOR.—It is contemplated to commemorate the founding and incorporation of a College in New Brunswick (now known as the University of New Brunswick) on the completion of its centenary, the 17th of February, 1900. I wonder what phases of its past life we Baptists will be called upon to emphasize. Perhaps the first will be the abolition of the religious tests. Perhaps most emphasis will be laid upon the new order of things. When the college took the name of the University of New Brunswick all denominations were supposed to have equal rights and privileges. The late Judge and Governor Wilmot took a great interest in the University, and in 1859, when it started on its new career, tried to infuse new life and break up the old state of affairs by having a gentleman appointed to the presidency who had graduated from the College in 1849. The new President may not have been all that was desired, but it was his misfortune to come in to break up the old regime. In short, it was made so unpleasant for him that in a short time he stepped down and out. After him came Dr. Jack, a gentleman well fitted for the position, who by travelling and visiting the Grammar and Superior schools of the Province did much for the Institution and a good deal in the way of breaking down prejudices. Judge Wilmot, notwithstanding the first fiasco, tried his hand again, and again had a co-religionist appointed, this time to a professorship. The professor (Thomas Harrison by name) proved to be a very shrewd man, readily took in the trend of affairs, and in time, anticipating the demise of Dr. Jack, cut the denominational traces and got into line for the succession. Well played, as they say at cricket, the professor won the coveted prize. Matters have run on in a sort of a way from that day to the present. Anglicans, Methodists and Presbyterians have at different times been represented; but Baptists (the largest Protestant body in the Province) is not now nor never has been represented on the faculty, though years ago a DeMille and a Fryor sought the honor. Prejudice and management have prevented. Of late years it has been so managed that the Institution is now run in the interest of one church—going back to foundation principles, you see.

It is high time a halt was called and simple justice done. While our young men are welcomed as students and their praises sung when graduating with honors, they never need hope to attain to any position on its teaching staff, strangers of a favored church are welcomed to the professorate. No self-respecting body ought to submit to this treatment. We again need a Wilmot, for it seems as if Baptists had to fight their battles anew. The "old Sem" looms up, when from 1836 to 1842 they had to fight, fight and fight. Those stalwart men, Wilmot and Fisher, did us great service. If we have the pluck and backbone of our fathers there will be a sharp turn soon. A new head to the University is needed. Let an honest and impartial administrator be appointed and the College on the hill will boom as never before.

Yours truly,
RICHARD H. PHILLIPS.

Fredericton, March 25,