

The Church Guardian,
A WEEKLY NEWSPAPER, PUBLISHED IN THE INTERESTS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

IT IS NON-PARTIZAN.

IT IS INDEPENDENT.

It will be fearless and outspoken on all subjects, but its effort will always be to speak what it holds to be the truth in love.

PRICE ONLY \$1 PER YEAR, PAID IN ADVANCE WHEN NOT PAID IN ADVANCE, \$1.50.

The Cheapest Church Weekly in America.

Address THE CHURCH GUARDIAN,
Lock Drawer 29, Halifax, N.S.

The Halifax Editor can be found between the hours of 9 a. m. and 1 p. m., and 2 and 6 p. m., at his office, No. 52 Granville Street, (up-stairs), directly over the Church of England Institute, and next door to the office of the Clerical Secretary.

DO THE LEADING DENOMINATIONS BELIEVE IN A "PRIESTHOOD" OF THE MINISTRY?

We have had considerable discussion in our columns respecting the Priesthood of the Ministry. We have stated our views very plainly, and have shown that while the people are a "royal priesthood," exercising, to a certain extent, Priestly functions, the Ministry as representing our Lord, and as ambassadors for Him, share in His sole Priesthood, and are in a real and true sense "Priests," not offering up "bloody sacrifices," as under the Jewish law, nor offering Christ again as in the so-called "sacrifice of the Mass," but that under the new and better dispensation of the Gospel, they offer "spiritual sacrifices acceptable unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." They are, therefore, in this sense entitled to the name of "Priests," which was plainly predicted of them by the Prophets. There is a view of the matter which has not been touched upon by our Correspondents, viz., that the leading denominations, while ready enough to deny the term to us or their own ministers, yet really claim the thing. And if they do, in their standards, and by the written words of their prominent men, and in their hymns, what sense is there in repudiating the name, when they are performing substantially the acts of Priesthood? We have only space to allude in this article to the Presbyterians, but proof could be brought respecting other bodies of Christians.

Albert Barnes, the celebrated Presbyterian commentator, in a note on Romans xv. 16: "A minister of Jesus Christ ministering the Gospel of God," says it means "performing the office of Priest in respect to the Gospel of God." In another place, he says, "acting in the Christian Church substantially as the Priests did among the Jews." If a man perform substantially the work of a Priest, and his official duties are those of the Priesthood, he may call himself what he likes, but he is a Priest to all intents and purposes. But we give a plainer proof. We take the Westminster Confession of Faith, which every orthodox Presbyterian is bound to recognize as authority. Under the heading, "The form of Church Government," we find:

"The pastor is an ordinary and perpetual officer in the Church.
First it belongs to his office:
To pray for, and with, his flock, as the mouth of the people, unto God.
To read the Scriptures publicly, as did the Jewish Priests and Levites.
To feed the flock by preaching of the Word, according to which he is to teach, convince, reprove, exhort and comfort.
To catechize.
To dispense other divine mysteries.

To administer the Sacraments.
To bless the people from God, as did the Jewish Priests and Levites.
To take care of the poor.
And he hath a ruling power over the flock as a pastor."
Under the head of "Church Censures" we find:

"To these officers the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, whereby they have power, respectively, to remit and retain sins, to shut the Kingdom against the impenitent, both by the word and censures, and to open it unto penitent sinners, by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, as occasion shall require."

Now, these duties are exercised by other Bodies likewise. Let those who are so afraid of the word "Priest," because Roman Catholics pervert its meaning, ponder the above. These ministers not only preach to the people, and thereby open the channels of grace, but they claim to be "their mouth unto God, and to bless them from God, to retain sins by word and censures, and to remit sins by the ministry of the Gospel, and by absolution from censures, thus turning people out of the Church, or Kingdom, or re-admitting them to the favour of God!

A man who does this may have a holy horror of the name of Priest, but all the time he is performing Priestly acts, and very fully, too. It would be but common honesty to say that he is assuming to be a Priest as much as the ancient Jews did.

Every time a Baptist minister pronounces the benediction, he is blessing the people from God, and performing a Priestly act; every time these ministers set apart bread and wine on the Table of the Lord, they are doing the same. According to Professor Eadie, of the United Presbyterians, "Consecration is the devoting or setting apart of any persons, things or places to the worship and service of God."

Professor Hodge, of the Presbyterian College at Princeton, N. J., says the Lord's Supper has been called a sacrifice, "because, in the style of the ancients, every religious action, whereby we consecrate any thing to God for His glory and our salvation, is called a sacrifice."

All this misunderstanding and discussion on the Priesthood arises from confusion about terms.

If our readers, who are in doubt on this matter, will examine the above definition, they will see that prayer, praise, alms, ourselves, our souls and bodies, the offering of bread and wine in the Holy Communion, and everything that we offer to God, are in a true sense spiritual sacrifices. The one who offers them has a right to the name of Priest. The laity are a Royal Priesthood, and exercise Priestly functions. The Ministry have the exclusive right of performing, in addition to the acts done by the Laity, certain other Priestly functions on behalf of the people. They are doubly entitled to the name of Priest. And no one who understands the meaning of the spiritual sacrifices that are offered under the Gospel, can possibly refuse the term of Priests, in a ministerial sense, to the "Ambassadors for Christ."

THE PROPOSED DIOCESAN TEMPERANCE SOCIETY.

We very much regret some of the remarks made at the debate on this Society in the Fredericton Synod. The question came up when most of the country Delegates had gone home. These delegates are the strength of our movement, and had they been there the vote, we believe, would have been reversed. The Bishop's remarks, we do not hesitate to say, have done us a harm, which probably he never intended. We can readily understand the feeling of his Lordship in reference to some extreme speakers, and certain doings under the

guise of temperance. But it is as unfair to condemn a movement such as ours, professedly a religious one, endorsed by the Archbishops and Bishops of England, and which has, as uncompromising advocates, such men as Bishops Lightfoot and Ellicott, the Archbishops of York and Canterbury and hosts of others, Bishops and Clergy, because some of its friends are unwise, as it would be to condemn Christianity for the excesses of some of its professors. The Divine Society is marred by failure, foolishness and excess. We certainly cannot expect a human society to be free from these. All that the promoters of the Society asked was the moral endorsement of the Synod, and their sympathy and assistance in the organization and union of Societies. The Diocese of Fredericton stands alone in its refusal. No Diocese where the matter has been brought up has ever refused, sooner or later, to sanction such a movement. We regret exceedingly that the Bishop's remarks have been quoted in defence by the liquor-dealers, and, at this important period in our struggle with intemperance, they have been spread far and wide through the secular and religious press of the Maritime Provinces and elsewhere, as giving aid and comfort to those whom His Lordship never intended to encourage. We intend to publish an able and brilliant article by Canon Farrar, which will answer some points on which His Lordship laid stress.

As to the other speakers, we hope, when the debate comes on again, they will be able to present something new. In fact, if they would only get such a paper as the *Church Temperance Chronicle*, and see what the most able and earnest men in the English Church are doing to stem the evil, and read their powerful articles, they would never come to the Synod with such worn-out arguments. Bishop after Bishop, and some of the ablest minds among the clergy, have answered, over and over again, those stale assertions about the Baptismal vow being all that was necessary, that the Church is the only Temperance Society, &c. One gentleman, who is also opposed, we believe, to Sunday Schools, characterized such a Society as "barbarous." We should like to place him in one of those great temperance gatherings in England, where assemble some of the most cultured, refined and intellectual men of the day—men whose reputation is world-wide, and whose Churchmanship is unquestioned, and ask him to make such a statement as that, and the other which he made, which we would not dare to utter ourselves. The word "barbarous" might be applied, but it would not be to a Society countenanced and endorsed by learning, culture and refinement.

We ask our opponents to study some of the forms of this evil, to go to the homes ruined by drink, to get the statistics and see how it is the direct progenitor of nine-tenths of the crime that we have to see how it is a stumbling-block in the way of men and women in our land. Then St. Paul's advice comes into force, that if this does cause these people to stumble, for example's sake, and for the good of others, we ought to abstain. If they are not prepared to do this, the least they can do is not to refuse help to those who are earnestly trying, by mutual co-operation, to rescue the servants of intemperance by a Society which is distinctively religious, and endorsed by the Mother Church. The Baptismal vow has not enabled these people to resist their besetting sin. It is the national sin of the English speaking race, and requires special efforts against it. How can men, with a solemn sense of that truth, say that "the drunkard shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven," refuse to give their support to any mea-

sure, even though they may not approve of all the details, which has for its object, the rescue of souls perishing in this way!

THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD.

A COMMITTEE has been formed in Montreal to provide accommodation for the Clerical and Lay Delegates to the Provincial Synod. It is a pity that the Railway expenses of the delegates cannot be defrayed. We would make no distinction between the Clergy and Laity. Some, perhaps, of each order may be glad to pay their own expenses, but in some way, funds ought to be provided, so that no eligible person should be debarred from nomination or election, because of the probable expense. In the Lower Provinces, no plan was proposed to meet this question this year (although in Nova Scotia a move has been made to form a fund for the future) consequently, each has to bear his own expense. The wealthier parishes ought certainly to vote a sum out of their funds to pay the expenses of those who go from them. The poorer parishes are not able to do this, consequently, the burden falls on those who are least able to bear it.

It may be said that those gentlemen who have the honor of representing the Diocese should be willing to pay their own way. But that is not the question. Men are elected to transact most weighty and responsible business in the interests of the whole Church in the Ecclesiastical Province. The delegates have as much right to be paid travelling expenses as the Members of our Legislatures. It seems to us that this should be settled by the Synod itself, and that some plan should be adopted of raising the amount in the eight Dioceses, which would enable the Treasurer of the Synod to pay mileage to each delegate. It should not be considered a Diocesan matter at all. The amounts raised ought to be placed under the control of the Central Body. We hope that this matter will be discussed at the approaching Session. As this is a question of principle, and not of private means, under present circumstances, as no plan has been decided upon, we suggest that each Parish that is able pay the Railway fare of its Rector, if a delegate. Where city Rectors have been elected, it would be a graceful act, and one that could easily be done, for their parishes to agree, in addition, to pay \$30.00 apiece to other Clerical Delegates, each Parish thus providing for one besides its Rector. We hope this matter will be settled in a business-like way by 1883. In the meantime, if any one can suggest a better plan, we shall be glad to publish it.

ROBERT RAIKES.

We direct attention to the advertisement elsewhere, with reference to a Portrait of the Founder of Sunday Schools. We shall be glad to receive orders for it.

WHY DO YOU WANT ME TO COME TO CHURCH?

It is perfectly clear to anyone with open eyes that vast numbers of our countrymen are not only indifferent to all the ordinances of religion, but many of them do not appear to have the slightest idea why they should come to Church. It is quite time, then, that an answer to the above question was attempted. The alienation is a fact none will deny. Doubtless many causes have combined to produce it, but we cannot help thinking that one fault is that man has been made too much of and God too little. In many Churches the pulpit has been made the centre of attraction, and has drawn with irresistible force all the seats around it, and nothing can be clearer than that everything has been arranged for the purpose of hearing the sermon, so that old people who are dull

of hearing, and deaf people who cannot hear, as well as others who are slow at comprehending what they hear, have quietly excused themselves from attending Church. Neither have the poor had much to induce them to go, seeing that the rich have had the first seats as at a lecture room, or concert hall, where people go to listen, while the poor have had to catch what they could in a far-off corner in a wretchedly uncomfortable seat, appropriately marked "Free." We cease to wonder why people have begun to look upon the Church as not for them, neither do we wonder that the true purpose of meeting has been forgotten. We would not be supposed to speak lightly of preaching; no man would do that who remembered its purpose, but things, however good, should be kept in proper places.

We are often told what a blessing it would be if men kept to their Prayer Book, as drawn up by the Reformers. We think so too, and for our part we have no other wish. If only men did so, there would be seen at once the true reason why all should go to Church, namely, to worship God. Very prominently is this set forward in the Prayer-Book. There is appointed a daily offering of prayer and praise, whereas the only time when a sermon is distinctly ordered is when the people have met together for a very different purpose, that is, to celebrate the Holy Eucharist, and to offer themselves unto God as living sacrifices.

We profess to be guided to some extent by the Primitive Church. Hence we look to see what the early Church has to tell us of this matter, and we find wherever a reason is given in our New Testament for Christians meeting together it is always for the purpose of worship, to "break the Bread." This was so even when an Apostle was to be present. We read, "When they met together to break bread Paul preached unto them." (Acts xx. 7), not the other way about, as we make it.

Neither was this idea of worship a new one. It had existed from the beginning. The patriarchs had their altars, and the Israelites had their Tabernacle and Temple, while the very heart of their worship was, not mere private edification, but an offering unto God of themselves and of their substance in an act of devotion. This has been the result in every case where true religion has existed, and as men have approached more nearly to God the stronger has worship grown upon them. Hence it is, that when St. John shows to us the action of the Heavenly Host it is described as an act of worship—they fall down before the throne of God, they cast their crowns at His feet, they offer to Him their praises as the expression of their homage and deep devotion.

"We are told that we in heaven shall be but the ripened perfection of what we are upon earth. What, then, must be our chief reason for coming to Church, the Palace of the King of Kings, but to join in the action of the Heavenly Host, "With Angels and Archangels" to give expression to our love and homage in public worship, to join with others of His loyal subjects in giving to Him the "honour due unto His name?" And what mortal can be excused from this? It is our clearest duty, as well for what He is in Himself, as for what He has done for us, to come out from the closet, where our personal wants are made known, into the broad daylight and publicly acknowledge Him, show our allegiance to Him, and our dependence upon Him. Our private "likes" and "dislikes," with regard to the service or preacher, have no power to excuse us from this duty. We are bound to "come before His presence with thanksgiving, and to show ourselves glad in Him with psalms." Let us listen, then, to the invitation the Church gives us, "O come, let us worship, and fall down, and kneel before the Lord our Maker."

Our first duty, then, is to come to Church to worship God, but we have no wish to forget that there is a deep blessing for ourselves in joining in this act of Public Worship. It must be so, inasmuch as the Lord is in His Holy Temple to dispense His favours. Nor in thinking of this can we be accused of selfishness, as some say. To strive to be perfect as "our Father which is in heaven" is perfect, and to seek His grace to help has little of selfishness in it. We need the in-strengthening power of His Spirit, that "we may apprehend that for which we are apprehended of Christ Jesus," and will He not give us His blessing as we worship? It was said by one in the