

quired for the purpose—where at first they would earn some money and their board by working for the farmer, and after a time if they prove themselves worthy and efficient, some thirty acres of land each would be allotted to them on certain approved conditions, and they would be assisted and encouraged in clearing it and in building houses for themselves. Thus it is thought that eventually under the blessing of God—a little colony of civilized Indians will spring up—and become a means of much good among those who are still living in barbarism. For all these things of course funds will be needed, but we remember with a grateful heart what God has done for us; we remember that the present buildings, which, completed and furnished, have cost nearly \$12,000 dollars, are all paid for, and that a balance even is left over, and we believe that God will provide the means for whatever work it is his will that we should undertake.

# STANDING WITH HIS BACK TO THE PEOPLE.

AN EXPOSTULATION WITH THOSE WHO USE THIS EXPRESSION.

My FRIENDS,—I am not one of the Clergy who adopt the position you characterize as above, which is otherwise (and let me add less offensively) termed the Eastward Position. I do not consecrate "before the Table" but at one end of it, and therefore perhaps you will hear what I would say upon this subject.

However, to be perfectly frank I will add, I adopt the southward position, not because I think it is the correct rendering of the disputed Rubric—but because it is at present the law of the land. My private judgment is that "standing before the Holy Table" means, standing in front of it. However, in this matter I practise what I preach, viz:—submit in non-essentials my private judgment to public or official judgment. Some day I doubt not, the public judgment will make at least optional what I conceive to be the true rendering of that Rubric, but until then I submit to law. However, let it suffice that at present, I do not stand with my back to the people; and let this weigh with you while you consider what I advance—not to turn you from your present opinion or practice, that is not my great object—but to prevent you from judging unrighteous judgment of those from whom you differ.

When you, my friends, use the term, "with his back to the people," you state what indeed is literally correct—the Eastward position is a turning of the back to the people, there is no question of that—but what I wish you to observe, is that the term conveys a false impression, and to do so is to act unjustly, and therefore to sin.

Now let me ask you my friends, what is the impression you wish to convey to the popular mind by this term? Is it not that the clergyman who adopts this position intends thereby to cast a slight upon his congregation? or at least to show himself by this attitude as one immeasurably above them, or to exalt himself in some degree?

If this is your meaning—and I think you will own it is—let me in all kindness, but candidly, assure you that you are thereby suggesting what is false. The fact is—though it may startle and perhaps amuse you—the position of turning their "backs to the people" is adopted by many from motives of—Humility.

It is because they do not wish to receive honour which belongs not to them, that

they do not arrogate to themselves the position of honour. It is because they desire to direct men's attention not to themselves but from themselves, that they adopt this, to many, objectionable position.

Consider for a moment, all the analogies in matters of worldly ceremonial and etiquette.

In all gatherings of people, where special respect or homage or honour is to be paid to any individual, that personage is always placed at the centre of the upper end of the hall or room, facing the people—at what artists call the "point of sight." If you go into the House of Lords in England, or into the Senate Chamber at Ottawa, you will find the "point of sight" on which you instinctively first cast your eyes, occupied by the throne of the Queen or of the Governor-General, where the great personage sits facing the people. So the Speaker in the House of Commons—so the Judge in the Court Room—so the Idol in the heathen temple—so on all occasions, among all sorts and conditions of men, the object of homage or adoration always occupies the "Point of sight," and always faces the people.

Now, if I wanted to exalt or magnify myself before my congregation, I should take care to follow this invariable rule, this universal instinct. I should see to it that the "points of sight" in "my" church should be covered by a grand Rostrum or Dias or Pulpit, on which should appear, MYSELF, facing the people—that the first object on which the worshippers, as they enter, should instinctively cast their eyes should be—myself, either standing in my pulpit or sitting on a gorgeous chair behind it, but always "facing the people,"—that there should be behind that throne of mine a dark paneling or arch, or something of that kind, or over it, some kind of canopy, all conducing towards setting-off MYSELF.

This is the position assumed by a Sovereign before his subjects, by a Judge before the litigants, by the Grand Lama before his creatures, by an Idol before its worshippers, and by a Protestant minister before his congregation.

On the other hand, while the Sovereign faces her subjects, her Chamberlains and all those in waiting do stand with their "backs to the people." If you are the guests of a person of wealth or distinction you will find, that while your host at the head of the table faces you, the butler at the sideboard, and the other servants will often have their "backs to the people."

It is then in order to show that the minister is, as his name indicates, the servant (*diakonos*) of His and your master and host, that he desires to stand like a Servant to remind you (*and himself*) that he is not your host, but only waiting on his Lord in your interests. It is for this reason that our churches and chancels are so constructed as to draw your attention from the servant to the Lord, and that the servant never assumes the position of honour.

Let me then ask you in all kindness, when discussing this matter, not to impute motives, which those who "turn their backs" disown, and which the very action itself, by all analogy, contradicts. If you object to the position, do so by all legitimate means; it is a fair subject for diversity of opinion. But do not (let me repeat), impute wrong motives, but try in charity to remember that they, who by "turning their back" assume the attitude, not of the master but of the attendant, wish thereby to testify:—

We preach not ourselves but Christ Jesus the Lord; and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake.

G. J. Low.

## THE CLERGYMAN'S MAGAZINE.

To the EDITOR OF THE DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

DEAR SIR,—A circular relating to the "Clergyman's Magazine," the organ of the Church Homiletical Society of England, was lately sent to every clergyman in the Dominion. There was in it, an apparent favouring of the clergy of the Church in the United States at the expense of the Canadian clergy—the subscription charged the former being only twelve shillings, or the same as that for English subscribers—while the latter were asked for three shillings sterling more.

I wrote to the Secretary asking to have this explained, and as I know that others besides myself were puzzled by it, I desire by your leave, to state through your columns that I received yesterday, a letter from Mr. Lansdell, in which he regrets the necessity for it, but states that it arises from the fact that "the postage costs three shillings more to Canada than it does to the United States, for although the letter postage is the same, the book postage is double."

He adds, that the Metropolitan of Canada, Bishop Oxenden, has consented to be one of the Patrons of the Society.

Yours faithfully, A. G. L. TREW.

## INTOLERANCE.

To the EDITOR OF THE DOMINION CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—The *Christian Guardian* has just been handed to me, in which I read in one of the Editorials of that paper:—"An address recently delivered by Rev. Gervase Smith, President of the Wesleyan Conference at Bolton, has attracted a good deal of attention because of the strong statements it contained, respecting the intolerance of some Church of England people against Methodists. Mr. Smith, in the course of his remarks, said, 'he regretted to say that in some places an attempt was being made on a large scale, to plant the heel of intolerant bigotry upon them as Methodist Missionaries,' &c., &c."

This utterance of the President of the Canadian Conference, about the Church of England is very different from that of the late President of the English Conference, Dr. Dixon, who says:—"The Church of England is as we think, the most prosperous body in the country. In the Church there is a very large and constantly increasing body of faithful, laborious and excellent men, who are the ornament of their profession, and a great blessing to the country. Many of these Clergy are eminent preachers, and attract crowds to their ministry by an effective eloquence. But they are equally, and if possible more eminent still as pastors. The church people are as liberal in their charities as other Christians. They do not, as it seems, consider the endowments of their church an excuse for neglect, or for withholding sacrifices and labours; but on the contrary, are most liberal in their contributions and exemplary in their labours. But besides the support of their own church, they are amongst the foremost in the country to give their assistance to general objects of Christian philanthropy. There is a simplicity and piety in some of the Clergy of the church, which we do not always find in others. They adopt plain preaching from religious convictions. They believe that plain and pointed preaching is necessary to secure the true end of preaching, namely:—the awakening and salvation of the people, especially the poor. And it must be allowed by all candid persons, that of all the ministers of the day in this country, the Clergy of the English church are the most indefatigable in the attempts to benefit the working classes and their families."

Again Dr. Dixon says, speaking of