

# Canadian Churchman

Toronto, April 11th, 1918.

## The Christian Year

Third Sunday after Easter, April 21st, 1918.

### EASTER JOY.

"And ye now, therefore, have sorrow; but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you." How strange those words must have sounded to those poor, perplexed men. He has been telling them how the world would learn to hate and despise them, how "they shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service," and then at the end He gives them a surprising word about joy—a joy so wonderful and so enduring that no man can take it from them.

Why does the Church at this season of her Year turn our minds to such thoughts, and bid us read these words of Our Lord, spoken as they were on the night which preceded the day which saw the culmination of the apparent failure of His life? It is because we are bidden to look at things in the light of the end; it is because Our Lord has here given us the clue as to how we must look at things which seem to point only to humiliation and failure. Our Lord gives this message to His Apostles on that night, because in His eyes all these sad facts—the agony in the garden, betrayal, injustice, desertion, Calvary, the grave—were illuminated and transformed by the tremendous fact which He knew was about to be accomplished—His rising again from the dead. The Resurrection of Our Lord Jesus Christ has changed the whole aspect of life. It has thrown light into dark places, has answered many difficult riddles, and has given us the power of looking at the facts of our life from a new point of view. The message He gave them that night, though they did not understand it then, was the message of the Resurrection, which means joy.

Well may we lay it to heart in these days of strain. As He spoke to His Apostles of old in an atmosphere which seemed fatal to joy, and at a time when overshadowing them were things which seem to make it impossible, so He speaks to us at this Eastertide in the midst of war. And the message of the Resurrection is always the same—joy in spite of opposition and failure. It was the apparent failure of His Life that brought about the Resurrection. He surrendered His Body to the soldiers, He lost His Life, but by this He conquered and rose triumphant on the third day, winning for us the joy He promised. We are so apt to be discouraged, to feel that our lives are failures. The right is so hard, the wrong is so easy. There is so little room for joy, so much room for discouragement. Life is perplexing, and the times are out of joint. But the Resurrection speaks of conquest for us, and conquest is joy. We can win through "the power of His Resurrection." Our Lord Jesus Christ that evening, on which He spoke the words of our Gospel, looked beyond the Cross and the grave to the victory of Easter, and He bids us look beyond earth's failures to the victory of the Resurrection, and see in it the certain pledge of the final triumph of those who trust Him through all.

\* \* \*

Though the past is irrevocable, it is not irreparable.—F. B. Meyer.

## Editorial

### EMPTY TITLES.

There is undoubtedly a strong feeling in Canada at present against the conferring of titles of any kind on Canadians by the British Crown. This feeling is not due to any lack of respect for the King, or for others in authority, but is due rather to a strong suspicion that such honours have not always been given to deserving persons, and also to a desire to prevent the development of artificial class distinctions in this country. And the most distasteful kind of honour is one that is made hereditary. No matter how worthy the person may be to whom the title is given first, there is no guarantee that those who bear it afterwards will do credit to it. Moreover, there is neither rhyme nor reason in the custom of handing on titles to men whose only claim to such is that they happen to be the sons of their fathers.

We believe in recognizing valuable service. There is far too great a tendency to allow a man to continue, year after year, in a responsible position without showing appreciation of the service he is rendering to his country. Few people object when such a man receives some public mark of distinction. We doubt, however, if the present system of leaving the selection of those who are to receive honours to the political leaders of our country is the best that can be devised. We are painfully aware of the fact that political influence has too often played an important part in such selections, and there is a very strong suspicion that dollars and cents have also been occasionally the deciding factor. The whole system of conferring honours is too much akin to the patronage system, and the quicker it is removed from political control the better. We do not wish it to be inferred that all, or even the majority, of the selections made in the past have been the result of political or monetary influence. Far from it. A large percentage of those on whom honours have been conferred have been worthy of them, but there have been just enough of the other kind to bring discredit upon the whole.

Canada is a young country, with strenuous days ahead, and she can well afford to move warily in this as in other matters. It is so very easy to establish a custom and so very difficult to get rid of it when it is found to be a mistake. We shall in all probability have a plethora of military titles after the present war, and colonels will be almost as plentiful in Canada as they were a few years ago in the land to the south. Adults, after all, are very much like children in some respects, and it would be amusing, were it not sad, to see the emphasis placed upon a title or other distinguishing mark. The aristocracy that is of real value is based on merit and not on birth or wealth or political power. And the only kind of aristocracy that Canada needs is a body of consecrated men and women who place their country above self, and who think more of the well-being of their fellowman, however humble or powerful he may be, than of any title that may, perchance, be conferred upon them.

\* \* \*

The Archbishop of York has come and gone. His visit and his words have left an impression that will not be forgotten for many a day. A man of strong personality and reasoning

powers, with a deliberate and pleasing manner of speech, and a voice that can be heard distinctly, he holds the attention of his audience from beginning to end. He has evidently aged rapidly in recent years, according to the testimony of those who saw and heard him in England at the Pan-Anglican Congress. His white hair would lead one to place his age in the sixties rather than slightly over fifty, and it is evident that the responsibilities of his high office, particularly in these trying times, are weighing heavily upon him. We have listened to several men from the Motherland speak on the subject of the war, but none of them spoke with the earnestness, the seriousness, or the vividness of the Archbishop. His visit to the United States, as well as to Canada, will undoubtedly bring the war nearer to this continent, and will impress upon the thousands who have been privileged to hear him the moral issues at stake.

\* \* \*

We have not heard what took place in other dioceses, but in the Diocese of Toronto no opportunity was given to the lay members of the Church to hear what the Archbishop of York had to say regarding its work. We consider that this was most unfortunate, not only because of the Archbishop's great work among laymen, but also in view of the effect of the war on our work in the future. A meeting for both clergy and laity should, we submit, have been arranged, and not one for clergy alone, as was done. It is only one more example of the sort of thing that kills the interest of laymen in the work of the Church. Their money is welcomed, and their help also, provided they are satisfied to keep in the background. The vast majority of laymen have no desire to monopolize the work of the Church, but they do ask to be treated as a vital part of it.

\* \* \*

We could not help thinking while listening to the powerful addresses of the Archbishop of York of the value that the presence of such men in its highest political councils must be to Great Britain. Every government has to deal with great moral issues. The future welfare of every nation, as a matter of fact, hinges on such rather than upon financial issues, and the men whose opinions should be of greatest value in deciding the course to pursue in such matters are the religious leaders of the country. Would it not be a good thing for Canada if some method could be devised whereby the religious leaders of this country could be consulted regularly by our political leaders? Why should not the Senate of Canada include a certain number of such men? We believe there is a great opportunity here to improve the character of the Senate, and also to make the Christian Church a more vital factor in our national life.

\* \* \*

A certain section of the city of Quebec has brought disgrace upon itself, and through itself, upon the city and province. It had a perfect right to object to the introduction of the Military Service Act, but once this became a law of Canada, they have, by their opposition, even to the extent of injuring or killing those appointed to enforce the Act, made themselves traitors and enemies. To show leniency toward them would be criminal and would bring the whole Act into disrepute. We were pleased to learn that it is the intention of the Dominion Government to spare no effort to treat all parts of Canada alike.