

change is made, this might be accepted as a solution of the difficulty. It certainly could not offend any other body of Christians. All that I counted for is that somehow it should be expressed in our title that we are the legitimate representative of the Catholic church of Canada, and not the church of another country merely in Canada. The exact form in which this is to be done may well be left for the church itself to decide.

3. The third and last objection is the legal one. The church in Canada, we are told, was intended to be, and still is, "an integral part of the Church of England," and, therefore, has no right to any other name, and if it does assume another name it severs its connection with that church. There can be no doubt that in the early days of the colonial church, it was thought by statesmen and lawyers that the church, as established by law, could be transplanted into the colonies, with all its privileges and restrictions. Most unfortunately, Erastianism then reigned supreme, and those in authority had little knowledge of the rights and powers of the church as apart from its civil connections. And till very lately this phantom was clung to as though it was a great reality. Letters Patent were issued by the Crown, conferring rights on bishops with the most solemn formality, till those documents were found by astute lawyers to be nothing but waste paper. I do not pretend to unravel the intricacies of ecclesiastical law which in the case of the "establishment," has, I fear, been allowed to get into a very chaotic state in England. But I appeal from the subtleties of legal fictions, to what facts have accomplished, it may be in spite of the intentions of lawyers and law, and I fearlessly ask can our church in this country be said to be any longer as a matter of fact, "an integral part of the Church of England?" The church in Canada is no part of the spiritual estate of the realm of England, like the Church of Canterbury. It is no part of the Constitution of England. It is not subject to *Jus Regium Ecclesiasticum*, whereby temporal punishments can be annexed to spiritual censures. It has no voice whatever in Convocation which is "the Church of England by representation." Its clergy cannot hold cures in England unless under special licenses from the Archbishop of Canterbury. Dioceses are created by its own Provincial Synods, and not by the Crown. Its bishops are elected by the free voice of the presbyters and laity of each diocese. No *Congé d'Élites* issued by the Crown, restricts the choices. We are bound by the ancient and common law of the Church Catholic. I know not by what else. When it is said that we are bound by the canons of the Church of England, "so far as they are applicable to our circumstances," it must be seen that the whole case is virtually conceded. Who is to decide the important point how far they are applicable? Will the Imperial Parliament? Will Convocation? If we ourselves are to be the judges, and to take what we like, and to leave what we do not like, it is evident that we are not bound by them till we bind ourselves.

That we in our synods, voluntarily accept the formularies of the Church of England, cannot make us an integral part of that church. It, on the contrary, conclusively proves that we are not. Fancy a province formally accepting the Acts of the whole Dominion, or a municipality the Acts of a Province, of which it forms an integral part! If there was any law but our own voluntary compact binding us as an "integral part of the Church of England," such a formal acceptance of those standards as the basis of our Constitutions would be absurd.

The Judicial Committee, in "Long versus the Bishop of Capetown," said that the result of its verdict was to place the Church of England, "in places where there is no church established by law in the same situations with any other religious body, is in no better, but in no worse position."

Let us boldly accept the position to which we have been brought by stern facts without encumbering ourselves with the frail threads of legal fictions.

The Pan-Anglican Synod of 1867 in its 8th Resolution, very wisely laid down, "That in order to the binding of the church of our colonial empire, and missionary churches beyond them, in the closest union with the Mother Church, it is necessary that they receive and maintain without alteration the standards of faith and doctrine now in use in the church. That, nevertheless, each province should have the right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the church as its peculiar circumstances may require, provided that no change or addition may be made inconsistent with the principles and spirit of the Book of Common Prayer."

We could desire nothing more. This resolution gives a guarantee for the closest union in doctrines and liturgical practices, while it allows reasonable diversity. Would that the church in this country would be bold enough to exercise a little of that "right to make such adaptations and additions to the services of the church" that she has, and the want of which so cripples the energies of the Mother Church. The day on which I date this letter, is the 99th

anniversary of the consecration of the first colonial Bishop of our church. Would it not be a most fit method of commemorating the centenary of this great event for the church of this country, which was the first to receive this blessing, to gather together representatives of our scattered portions who might consider, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, if some means cannot be adopted whereby greater consolidation, and thereby power, might not be obtained for our church in this Dominion, and a name assumed more truly indicative of our position in this country, and in the confederation of dioceses of the one Church Catholic, so that when the centenary anniversary arrives, a great assembly of the whole church, may be held at which the decisions formulated by the representatives and ratified by the Provincial Synods and the independent dioceses of British Columbia, should be promulgated, and an era of increased power and vitality, may we not trust, under the blessing of God, inaugurated for our beloved church.

I am, yours faithfully,
St. John's College, ADELBERT,
Qu'Appelle, N. W. T., Bishop of Qu'Appelle.
August 12th, 1886.

Notes on the Bible Lessons

FOR SUNDAY SCHOOL TEACHERS, ON
THE INSTITUTE LEAFLETS.

Published under authority of the Sunday School Committee of the Toronto Diocese.

Compiled from Rev. J. Watson's "Lessons on the Miracles and Parables of our Lord" and other writers.

SEPTEMBER 5th, 1886.

VOL. V. 11th Sunday after Trinity. No. 41

BIBLE LESSON.

"The Two Debtors."—St. Luke vii. 36, 50.

The occasion on which this parable was uttered, is given earlier in this chapter. We then see that John the Baptist had sent his disciples to Christ with the question, "art thou He that should come," and we are told that while some accepted Jesus as the Messiah many rejected Him. The Pharisees had not yet become His open enemies, and we find that, when one of them, named Simon, invited Him to dine with him, Jesus accepts the invitation.

1. When the Parable was spoken. In the East, owing to the great heat, the customs of society were quite different from ours; people wore sandals, and on entering a house left them at the door; being supplied with water to wash their feet, which were then rubbed with oil to keep them soft. The host always embraced his guests on their arrival, when the meal was served they reclined on couches round the table, leaning on their left arms, with their feet turned outwards.

It appears that the Pharisees had not offered to our Lord the customary tokens of hospitality, perhaps thought he was honoring Him sufficiently by inviting Him. But who is this who stands behind Jesus, bending over His feet, in floods of tears? see her wiping them with her long hair, embracing them and anointing them with ointment, verses 37, 38. Ah, this was an uninvited guest, a poor, sinful woman, feeling the shame and burden of her sins, perhaps had heard the gracious invitation "Come unto Me," see St. Matt. xi. 28, 29. She will sin no more, He will help her if she can but get near Him. Does He scorn her? No. But what does Simon think? verse 39. His exclusive pride rises up, (Isaiah lxxv. 5), he almost regrets having invited Jesus. Surely He can not be the Prophet he took him for. Jesus sees into both their hearts. He knew the past history of the woman, and her deep sense of her sinfulness, and her longing to be forgiven. He knows, too, what Simon is thinking of, and He sees that there is no sense of sin there, or love either. He, therefore, speaks this parable, verses 40, 41. We may notice here, that commentators are generally agreed that this is a record of a different act from that recorded of Mary of Bethany by St. Matthew, St. Mark, and St. John, and that the idea that the woman was Mary Magdalene is also purely traditional.

2. Why was the Parable spoken. It is very short and simple. There are two debtors, one owes ten times as much as the other; neither can pay, they are bankrupt. But to their great joy, their creditor kindly forgives both of them their debt. We are not told anything about their gratitude, but our Lord takes it for granted, and asks Simon which of their hearts would be fullest of love. Simon at once answers, verse 43, "I suppose he to whom he forgave most." Let us see what this parable taught Simon. That he would learn a lesson from the poor woman he so despised, verse 47. He had no faith in Jesus,

no feeling of sin, therefore, had received little forgiveness, his religion was merely formal, yet Jesus speaks gently to him, warning him that it was not yet too late.

And how must the broken and contrite heart of the woman have thrilled as she hears Jesus recount, one by one, and with approval, her ways of treating Him. She could not have explained it, but the kind and gentle Jesus understood all about it, and pointed out that the greatness of her love, attesting as it did, the genuineness of her faith and repentance, was a proof that she had found pardon and acceptance with God, and see the sweet message Jesus has for her, verse 50, "Thy faith has saved thee, go in peace." What does this parable teach us? God is the Creditor. We are his debtors, all owing him something, and unable to pay our debt. Do we realize this? feel how poor our goodness is, "nothing to pay," then there is hope for us, for then, like the woman, we shall come to Christ—confess our sins, and there is forgiveness for us, 1 John i. 7, 9, the debt is paid to the uttermost farthing, "the blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin." He waits to see us thankfully accept it, Micah vii. 18, 19, the words are already on His lips, "Thy sins be forgiven thee, go in peace." May we be ready to give up every bad thing for His sake, all good things to His service.

Love so amazing, so divine,
Demands my soul, my life, my all.

Family Reading.

CONTENT.

"Success is in God's hands; whatever happens will be His ordering, and therefore by His Grace I shall be content."—*Penelun.*

"Success is in His hands alone."
Peace rebel heart, thy tumult still;
Canst thou not trust Him with His own
Who rulest all things by His Will?

Stern was the voice, I trembling heard,
And all my spirit failed within,
For doubt and fear within me stirred,
Yet fear was faithless, doubt was sin.

"It must be best, it must be well,"
Rest aching heart, I strove to say;
But though my fears I would not tell,
The blinding tears I could not stay.

Resigned, submissive, murmuring not,
To this I thought I might attain,
But ah! "content" with such a lot,
"Content" with such a life of pain.

Then rose a whisper, silver clear,
Within this trembling heart of mine,
And through the darkness of my fear
There dawned the light of love divine.

"Trust Me, My child," he softly said,
"Though as a king I rule above;
The thorny path thy feet must tread,
I trod before thee in My love."

"I bore the Cross for love of thee,
For thee crown of thorns I wore;
And now I ask for love of Me,
Wilt thou not try to trust Me more?"

"I see the end, I know the way,
I love thee with a perfect love,
Thou too shalt see it all one day,
Made clear at last in Heaven above."

So in His presence kneeling low,
My storm-tossed spirit sank to rest;
For more I do not need to know,
This knowing, that He knoweth best.

His life of love for me was spent,
His love alone my soul can fill,
And therefore by His grace, "content,"
My all I offer to His will.

Boscombe Chime.

G. E. V. in New and Old.

SOME INCONSISTENCIES IN MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH.

1st. When persons go to church arrayed in fine clothes and costly apparel and expensive jewelry, and put only a few cents on the offertory plate, as their offering to the Lord.

2d. When they spend large sums in pleasure and personal gratification, and give nothing, or