

The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth--Apostolic Order."

VOL. VIII. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, JUNE 30, 1888. NO. 230

CALENDAR.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

Day	Date	MORNING	EVENING
S. July	1	S. Mt. Trin.	1 Sam. 13; Luke 13
M. "	2	"	Prov. 13; Luke 14
T. "	3	"	Prov. 15; Luke 15
W. "	4	"	Prov. 17; Luke 16
Th. "	5	"	Prov. 19; Luke 17
F. "	6	"	Prov. 21; Luke 18
S. "	7	"	Prov. 23; Luke 19

DOCTRY.

FOR THE CHURCH TIMES.

LINES SUGGESTED BY A LATE EVENT.

Death hath prepar'd the cup,
The poison she doth swallow;
With lips all cold and blue,
And cheeks all pale and hollow;
While roand about her bed,
Stand kindred fill'd with dolour.

Fond Mother, give her up!
God is her spirit taking;
She's sinking in the sleep
That knoweth not awaking;
Thou canst not keep her back,
Although thy heart were breaking.

Kind Father, be resign'd!
Give up thy cherish'd daughter;
Thy Father call her home,
Thy Saviour's blood hath bought her.—
Oh, think of Abraham's faith,
When call'd his son to slaughter!

Yeung Brother, weep no more!
And sisters cease your wailing!
The life blood ne'er again
Shall flush the cheek now paling;
Soon ye'll cross the ocean too,
Where now her bark is sailing.

Disturb her not with sob,—
Life's tie is nearly riven;
Against the fears of death,
Her soul hath nobly striven;
And still her speech hath been,
Of Angels, and of Heaven.

Oh, powerless as all
On Earth to longer keep her;
Ye must perseve, lay down,
In dust, your lov'd sleeper!
None can the sickle stay
Of Death, the mighty reaper.

Nought can ye do but pray
To God for resignation!
Her soul is happy now,—
And, in se'abnegation,
Let thinkin' of her bliss,
Be your true consolation.

Shearman, A. R.

Religious Miscellany.

THE APPOINTMENT OF OUR BISHOPS.

VARIOUS painful reports have been in circulation through the Prince, partially founded on Sir George Grey's statement in the House of Commons, and partially the traced to private communications, that there exists a determination on the part of the home Government to retain the appointment of the Canadian Bishops in its own hands. We do not imagine there is really any previous intention of carrying off so high-handed a measure. It would indeed be an insult to the Canadian Church, which would lead a most painful controversy, to compel it to raise funds for the endowment of Bishopsrics, depriving at the same time of power in nominating to the vacancies. And even if a large proportion of the endowment funds came from England, as a matter of policy and right our synods should be consulted.

It is so supposed that the sole object in view in extending the Episcopate is the glory of God, and the good of his church, and it cannot be doubted but that the living in this country can succeed better in carrying out this great object than those across the Atlantic who are but imperfectly acquainted with our situation and requirements. We have always been of opinion that it was the bounden duty of the

English Church to assist most liberally in the endowment of our Bishopsrics as well as our missions, from the fact that this country is the great receptacle into which emigration from the mother country flows—from the fact that every year many thousands of churchmen are landed amongst us, of the humblest classes, wholly unable and generally speaking, unwilling from being unaccustomed to it, to do anything towards the support of the ministrations of religion amongst them. This is a point of the subject on which we might say much, but our space will not at present permit us to do so.

The *Guardian* of May 2nd contains a letter from its Toronto correspondent, which harmonizes in so many particulars with our own view of matters connected with the proposed Canadian Bishopsrics, that we gladly copy the following extract—

"At the last meeting of the Synod of Toronto, the question of the powers to be exercised by the laity with respect to the election of Bishops was discussed, but on account of its vast importance, a final decision on the matter postponed until the next session, so that time should be given for its thorough ventilation. Some of our clergy are of opinion that such selections should be left to the clergy alone, while others approve of the system pursued in the American Church of rendering it necessary that there should be a majority of the laity as well as the clergy to make an election valid. The chief argument for the former course is, that the clergy are better qualified to form an opinion as to the relative merits of the candidates than the laity. So far as the result is concerned, I do not think it matters much which plan is adopted. Their lay representatives will, as a general rule, support the choice of their respective clergy, while as a matter of mere policy in the present state of the Canadian Church, dependent on a great extent on a voluntary principle, it is advisable to give the laity quite as much influence in our convocations as they possess in the adjoining republic. The Rev. J. Beaven, D. D., late professor of Divinity in King's College, who religion was thrown overboard, has brought his profound patristic knowledge to bear upon this subject, and his researches so far go to prove that the course which expediency would dictate—the granting of like powers to each body—is the course sanctioned by the practice of the primitive Church. And, indeed, I am strongly of opinion that in this, as well as in other Synodical matters, the best interests of the Church as well as the dictates of prudence require that the laity should be on an equality with the clergy. In the convocations of the American Church they are a decidedly Conservative element, and I do not fear but that they will prove the same here. The sound practical knowledge and business habits which the lay delegates usually possess, and which the clergy usually do not, proved there, and brief indeed as is the space since we flung off the rusty fetters of obsolete statutes, have proved here, of inestimable value in discussing the subjects brought before them.

It is currently reported here that a brother of the Hon. F. Hincks is to be the first bishop of the new diocese of Kingston. There are two brothers, Irish clergymen, one of them a well known Oriental scholar, the other is said to be very low in his churchmanship—which of them we are to be favored with I cannot say, but I have heard it is the latter. Our ex Premier, and another brother, a professor in Toronto University, are Unitarians. The parishes contained in the limits of the new diocese are making strenuous efforts to complete "the Bishopsric Endowment Fund," with the avowed object of exercising the right of choosing their own bishop. *It would be a most impolitic step, pregnant with evil consequences, for the Colonial Secretary to endeavor to force a bishop upon the Canadian diocese without its consent, although many of the clergy would prefer having one from England or Ireland than from among their own ranks at present.*—*Toronto Church.*

"I AM NOT FIT FOR COMMUNION."—And this is said with as much assurance as though it were a perfect justification for neglecting the Sacrament. Indeed, at first sight, it seems to pay a compliment to that ordinance, and then to take credit on the ground of humility. There is, indeed, a sense in which

the best of persons are not fit, as it is beautifully expressed in the words, "We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under the table." This, however, is a worthy unworthiness, which some as keeps truly pious persons away, when it should be the very cause of their coming. But this is the meaning of the excuse above mentioned. They who offer it are indeed not fit, because they do not repent of their unfitness, nor seek to amend it. In truth the subject gives them very little concern, and they meet the Saviour's express command by a mere excuse. Nor should they come; they would receive injury if they do so. Their sin is, not in staying from Communion because unfit, but in not securing the necessary fitness, not repenting as they might; not putting on the wedding garment offered to their acceptance. They will break Christ's command in one respect. And they shall find that two wrongs never make a right, particularly when done by the same person. Hear what the Church says to such: "If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come, wherefore, then, do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, are ye not ashamed to say ye will not come?"

OUR DEPENDENCE UPON GOD.

AMONG the bad qualities of the heart, that of ingratitude has our especial aversion. We cannot bear to see it exhibited, either towards ourselves or others. Accordingly he who, in return for benefits bestowed, has no acknowledgment to make, is justly censured: and if people turn away from Him when he may again stand in need of assistance, it is deemed a very proper punishment for his former misconduct.

A reason why the sin of ingratitude is visited with particular severity, is because there is no excuse for its commission. On the contrary, it seems repugnant to nature to treat a benefactor with indifference or contempt. Even among brute creatures we expect to find, in some degree, a recognition of our kindness; and often we are impressed with the idea, that all they want is language to declare that they are *thoughtful* for every attention they receive at our hands.

Yet in the conduct of man there is here a strange inconsistency. He wishes his bestowal of benefits to be properly appreciated. He cannot bear the thought of suffering the sting of ingratitude by one whom he has befriended; while the idea of any ingratitude on his part never seems to enter his mind, when he is well aware that every day he is the recipient of countless blessings without making any due return, or thinking even of their source. He exhibits less thankfulness for a thousand acts of kindness from his Maker than he expects from his fellow man for a single one which he confers. And not only this, but he often shows a disposition to ignore Him altogether, as if he would in this way ease his conscience for his indifference of duty towards his first and greatest Benefactor. But after all, there is nothing gained by this course.

Life is so full of changes—sorrows follow so fast on joys, and disappointments so often annihilate our fondest hopes—that without a constant remembrance of our dependence upon God, we can have no enduring peace and happiness. It is in vain to suppose that, while we exhibit towards Him only ingratitude for His goodness, we can derive any profit. In the experience of us all, there come times when the need of His support and favour is urgently felt. But unless we rest upon Him in prosperity, why may we hope in adversity to be cheered by His comforting presence. It is only as we feel continually our dependence, that we can render Him that service which is His due, and retain His love and favour.

Our present life has narrow bounds. At best it lasts but a little while, and shortening day by day, we soon pass away from among the living and are forgotten. It can never satisfy the longings of the soul for rest and happiness. Even if it were not overshadowed by dark clouds, it is too brief to afford us the enjoyment which we seek. Decay is written on every thing around us, and we ourselves know not but that our next step may lead directly to the tomb.

In a condition such as this there can be no real