

which had extended over fifteen months, of which the last two were passed in St. Leonard's. He was suffering from enlargement of the heart, which had recently been aggravated by congestion of the lungs. The funeral took place on Tuesday at Canterbury. The first portion of the funeral service was held in the Cathedral, upon entering which the procession was met by the Archbishop and the clergy and choir, and conducted to the east end of the nave, where the service took place. The coffin was covered with beautiful floral wreaths and crosses. The lesson was read by Archdeacon Smith. The hymn was "Comes at times a stillness as even." The service was attended by 400 clergy, and by a large number of the county and local magistrates and private persons from the neighbouring towns in the diocese. At two o'clock the procession left the Cathedral on its way to the little church of St. Martin, in the graveyard of which the body was interred. The route through the Cathedral yard was lined by the 7th Hussars, the route through the streets being kept by the rest of the soldiers in the garrison. A party of the East Kent Rifle Volunteers, with their commandant, Colonel E. W. Knocker, formed a guard of honour. At the grave the Archbishop took part in the service, which was performed in the presence of several thousands of spectators. "Thy way, not mine, O Lord," was sung as a processional hymn from the lych-gate to the grave; and "Now the labourer's task is o'er," and "Jesus lives," were subsequently sung at the grave side. The body was laid to rest in a plain grave, the earthen sides of which were hidden with flowers and moss. It is worthy of note that Bishop Parry and the Bishop Suffragan of Nottingham (MacKenzie), who were both appointed in the same year (1870) were the first Suffragan Bishops consecrated in the Anglican Church for nearly 300 years. In 1882 he was elected by the Australian Bishops to the Bishopric of Sydney, as Metropolitan of Australia and Tasmania, but he declined the nomination.

THE POLITICAL OUTLOOK.

What is the duty of English churchmen at the approaching election? We are all familiar with questions of this kind in England and in Canada. And the answer, in a general way at least, is a very simple one. The duty of churchmen, like the duty of all other men, is to do what they think right. Churchmen, as such, are neither Conservatives nor Liberals; and there could be nothing more injurious to the spirit and character of the Church, or more hurtful to its best interests, than that it should be capable of being ticketed as belonging to the one party or to the other.

Every intelligent churchman is both Conservative and Liberal. Rather, he is Liberal because he is Conservative, because he knows that it is only by wise adjustment and progression that existing institutions can be made permanent. And, in the same way, he is Conservative because he is Liberal, because he knows that it is only by honouring the past, by reverently guarding what it has handed down to us, that true progress can be made. This is true even of theology in a sense. It is quite true of ritual; and it is eminently true of politics, of civil government.

Now, there is so little of novelty in these propositions that it may be said that most men, all thoughtful men in fact, do more or less perfectly recognize them; although the mode of their recognition takes different forms. For example, one class of men hold themselves bound to join a Conservative party as the best means of giving effect

to the principles. Other men, for the very same reason, feel obliged to join a Liberal party. We say a Conservative and a Liberal party, because the old lines are now nearly obliterated, and it is often difficult by comparing opposing parties, to discover any clear principle of separation. So again, another class of men will join no party; but will watch the doings of both, and support the action which they deem most advantageous for the interests of the country. Any one of these lines is perfectly reasonable and defensible so long as it is conscientiously adopted.

At the present moment there are very few strictly political questions which divide the two or three parties in this country. The Equal Rights party, although breaking off from the Conservative party in the Dominion elections, seem to make common cause with the Conservative in Ontario. We are not quite sure that we are able to go with the equal righters. We have already said our say on the subject of Jesuit incorporation, and we see no reason to change our opinion on that question.

As regards Separate Schools, as we understand the matter, these are guaranteed by the constitution; and we confess that we cannot quite understand the consistency of Anglicans in opposing them. If they were to contend that all should be put on the same footing, that Separate Schools should be granted to every religious community which should be willing to be organized for this purpose, we could understand the demand; but from those who have always contended for denominational education and have protested against the sufficiency of undocctrinal Christianity, the protest is not quite intelligible.

On one point we must agree entirely with Mr. Meredith, and the matter cannot be too soon looked into and understood by all who have the best interests of the country at heart. We refer to the placing of the educational department outside the domain of party politics. No one can justify the present arrangement in theory; and we believe that, in practice, it works very badly. In saying so, we mean no disrespect to the head of the government or to the minister of education; we have only to recall to the recollection of our readers incidents which have occurred during the last few years, which would have been impossible under a different system. We have reason to believe that, on this subject, there is little difference of opinion among the leading teachers in the schools and universities; and we believe that the public in general are with them. If, then, it is only the politicians who are in favour of continuing the present most undesirable state of things, the politicians may be speedily made to understand that they are the servants of the public and not their masters.

The question of licensing is one which needs to be carefully looked after. If any ministry, by whatever name it may be called, or whatever principles it may profess, shall be found using their powers, not for the public good, but for the benefit of members of their own party, they are guilty of a heinous crime against the public; and the sooner they are impeached the better. We do not say that such things have been done either in the Dominion or in the Province. But we say that anything of the sort would be a crime against the commonwealth; and the man who will discover it will be a public benefactor.

There has been some proposal to tax buildings used for purposes of religious worship and education. We trust that the rumour has no foundation. We have no hesitation in saying that any

politician making such a proposal could have no claim to the support of churchmen. To this and other subjects it may be our duty to return hereafter.

THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY.

CHAPTER IV.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF THE MEMBERS OF CHRIST.

CONSEQUENCES OF CONTROVERSY.

One evil consequence which has resulted from the controversial treatment of this doctrine, is the habit of dwelling upon the privileges of the priesthood rather than upon its responsibilities. No one who has ever listened to the most strenuous advocates of the universal priesthood of Christians can have failed to be struck by this peculiarity. Whether the theme of the orator has been isolated texts like those which we have quoted, or the argument in the Epistle to the Hebrews respecting our Blessed Lord's priesthood, the practical application of the subject has been either to prove that there could be no Christian priests appointed to minister in the congregation, or else that every Christian had all the priestly privileges to himself. But seldom indeed does it seem to occur to the speaker to dwell upon that which must surely be the true outcome of all such belief, namely, the awful responsibilities imposed upon those who are admitted to such exalted privileges.

THE TRUE MEANING.

In the greatness of these privileges we do, of course, most thoroughly believe; but it is necessary for one moment to pause on the unlawful use which is frequently made of the famous argument on the priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews. The chief object of that Epistle is to set forth the greatness of the revelation and work of Jesus Christ in comparison with the preparatory dispensation which it had supplanted. This is done in various ways, by showing our Lord's superiority to angels, and to Moses, the giver of the law; and at greatest length, by drawing a contrast between His priesthood and that of the Aaronic priests. In illustration of the greatness of His priesthood, it is stated that it does not pass away, and that it has really made for us a way into the holiest of all, which never could be done by the sacrifices under the law.

INFERENCES.

The most remarkable and curious inferences are constantly drawn from these statements. It is inferred with the utmost confidence that there can be no priesthood in the Christian Church, inasmuch as our Lord's priesthood abides perpetually with Him; and it is further asserted that the whole privileges of the priesthood have passed to all believers because they have power to enter "into the holiest of all by the blood of Jesus."

Now, the slightest consideration of the passages if it be conducted attentively and fairly, will convince us that, whatever may be the truth on these subjects, there is absolutely no support whatever to the statements ordinarily made, in the passages from which they are professedly drawn. There is nothing at all said or implied on the subject of the Christian ministry. For aught that the Epistle to the Hebrews has to say on the subject, it might be non-existent; and as for the universal priesthood of believers, there is not so much as an allusion to it. The author's argument is not that we are all made priests and can now do more than the Jewish priests could do; but that our Blessed Lord, the High Priest of our confession, has done for us more than the Jewish High Priest could do for those on whose behalf he ministered. Those high priests offered daily, and they once a year went within the veil; but the sacrifices which they presented had not power to cleanse the conscience; and so the veil hung there between the worshippers and the most holy place; but when our Blessed Lord offered that perfect sacrifice which was completed on the Cross, then the veil of the temple was rent, the accuser of the brethren was cast down, and sinful man, now reconciled, had boldness of access even into the holiest of all by the Blood which had been shed for his redemption.

The greatness of the sacrifice of our Blessed