

and if each member has an invisible relationship to Him as its Head.

Q. May not our Lord mean by "born of water and the Spirit" a conscious change having nothing to do with Baptism?

A. We cannot reasonably think that He would express so mysteriously the simple change implied in repentance and conversion.

Q. But may there not be a birth of water in Baptism and another of the Spirit later on?

A. No: for a birth is one, and this birth is "of water and the Spirit"—one thing and at one time.

Q. What makes us sure of this?

A. That in many other places of Scripture the reception of Baptism is connected with spiritual blessings or benefits; as with salvation, St. Mark xvi. 16; with remission of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and salvation, Acts ii. 37, 38; with regeneration, Titus iii. 5; with salvation, 1 St. Peter iii. 21.

Q. Any other places?

A. Yes: Acts xxii. 16; Ephes. v. 26; Romans vi. 1-4, Col. ii. 12.

Q. What then do you conclude?

A. That our New Birth is the work of the Spirit, through the application of water in Holy Baptisms in the name of the ever blessed Trinity.

#### THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

The mount on which the sermon was delivered was probably the singular elevation now known as Kurn Hattin. It is the only conspicuous hill on the west side of the lake, and is singularly adapted by its conformation, both as a place for retirement and for the gathering together of large multitudes. The people had probably seen our Blessed Lord wending his way hither the evening before, and hither in the morning, eager to listen to the gracious words that fell from His lips, the multitude followed Him—not only from the densely peopled shores of the Sea of Galilee, but even from Judea and Jerusalem; nay, even from the distant sea coasts of Tyre and Sidon. They had crowded to touch His person and hear His words. From the peak where He had just chosen and commissioned His disciples, He descended to the flat summit of the hill, and first of all gave attention to the physical wants of those of His hearers who were sick, healing their diseases, and dispossessing the unclean spirits of the souls which they had seized. And then when the multitudes were seated in calm and serene attention on the grassy sides of that natural amphitheatre, He raised His eyes and opening His mouth, He delivered primarily to His disciples, but intending through them to address the multitude, that memorable discourse which will be known forever as the Sermon on the Mount.

The Sermon began with the word blessed, a new revelation of blessedness. The people were expecting a Messiah, who should break the yoke off their necks, a king clothed in earthly splendour, and manifested in the pomp of victory and vengeance; but Christ reveals to them another king, another happiness—the riches of poverty, the royalty of meekness, the high blessedness of sorrow and persecution. And then followed a comparison of the new law of mercy with the old law of threatening. The old was transitory, this permanent; the old was a type and shadow, the new a fulfilment and completion; the old demanded obedience in outward action, the new was to reach down to and control the thoughts; the old contained the rule of outer conduct, the new the secret of obedience. The command, "Thou shalt do no murder," was henceforth extended to angry words and feelings of hatred. The guilt of adultery was declared to be involved in a lascivious look. The law of equivalent revenge was superseded by a law of absolute self-abnegation. The love due to our neighbour was extended also to our enemy. Henceforth the children of the Kingdom were to aim at nothing less than this: namely, to be perfect, as their Father in heaven is perfect.

#### Biblical Notes and Queries.

##### Questions.

ANGLO-CAN writes to know the authority for the use of a lay server at the celebration of the Holy Communion. (2) Supposing such an adjunct to be necessary and legitimate, what are his duties?

#### Correspondence.

All Letters will appear with the names of the writers in full and we do not hold ourselves responsible for their opinions.

#### MULTIPLICATION OF UNIVERSITY DEGREES.

DEAR SIR,—During the last session of the Ontario Legislature, there was a bill proposed and referred

to the Private Bills Committee, to enable the new Divinity School in Toronto to have the power of conferring degrees granted to them. The consideration of the Bill was postponed until the next session, in order that an expression of opinion from the whole Church in the Dominion, through the voice of her Synods, might be heard, either for or against the granting of such powers; as they conceded that it was only fair that a matter of such importance to a Church, of which the majority of that Committee were not members, should not be hastily acted upon, especially as it appeared to be a measure sprung upon the consideration of the House.

Such being the case, I take the liberty of bringing the matter under your notice, and also I hope of all the members of the Church throughout the Dominion; in order that it may be brought up in the Synod of each diocese, and such an expression of opinion, couched in the form of a memorial, passed by them, which would embody in it not only the sentiments of Churchmen, but also such reasons and common sense arguments against this multiplying of titles, and other objections which would commend themselves forcibly to the minds of men who are not expected to think with ourselves in this matter, they not being members of our Church; and who, unless very strong arguments were used, would naturally side with the men who are advocating this bill. So that I trust that the very foremost men amongst us, and those best able to give a reason for the faith that is in them, will take up the subject at once, and not slack their hand until they have brought it to a successful issue; and so as much as possible, to put a stop to the breaking up of our Church into infinitesimal parties, which is being now attempted by these men, who at the election of the present Bishop of Toronto promised that if we—that is the so-called High Church party—would agree to certain concessions, and meet them as it were on neutral ground, that the opposite party would drop their main differences, and work with him as united members of the Church of England in Canada; and that they would abolish the society known as the Church Association, which latter they have fulfilled in the letter but not in the spirit of the agreement, as evinced by their desire to build up an institution in direct antagonism to the College which the Bishop is in duty bound to uphold; and as he could not well be the head of this rival institution, some one else must be, which would result in the fact of their being an *imperium in imperio*. Trusting that this subject may receive all the consideration which it deserves,

I am yours truly,

H. B. WHITE.

May 15th, 1882.

#### VESTRY MEETINGS.

SIR,—Allow me to endorse the remarks of Mr. Rowe in your issue of the 4th inst. It seems to me that there is some lack of statesmanship in our Ecclesiastical Parliaments; and enactments are made inconsistent with each other, or with the laws proper of the Church. For instance, a standing law of the Church is that every parishioner should communicate at least three times a year; yet by our constitution of Synod we admit to the highest lay position, that of delegate to Synod, one who has communicated only once. Is not this contrary to the spirit of the Church's laws? If a legislator of the Church need communicate only once, of course the inference is that the rank and file may do so less frequently.

Again, as to vestry meetings, Mr. Rowe well pointed out the anomaly, that in a church where pews are rented, all who pay have a right to vote, no matter what their religious views may be; whereas in a "Free" church all who call themselves members of the church and habitual attendants may vote, whether they pay anything or not.

We of the diocese of Ontario have lately remedied (after a fashion) this inconsistency, by excluding from voting in all our churches, whether the pews are rented or free, all those who cannot subscribe themselves as "members of the Church of England, and of no other religious body." But it seems to me the remedy is worse than the disease; and I fear it is a piece of legislation, if not unjust, at least so unjust in its character, that it will probably give rise to endless annoyances hereafter; and our narrowing policy will repel men from our communion, instead of attracting them. There are very many of our congregations which contain men who are not strictly Churchmen; yet, attracted to the Church by one cause or other, are most active, useful, liberal members thereof, far more so than many who would sign their names readily enough "in a book to be kept for that purpose," but beyond that act would do nothing whatever to promote the Church's temporal welfare.

Let me put a case founded on my own experience, not here, but in other places of which I have had charge. In a certain parish, let us say, there is no Presbyterian service. In consequence of this, most of the Presbyterians come to the Church. They are re-

gular attendants and liberal subscribers; their weekly envelopes form quite an item in the clergyman's income. At the Easter vestry a surplus is in the hands of the churchwardens. Why should a number of men who have given nothing vote as to the disposal of that money, while those whose liberality contributed to that surplus, are disfranchised? Or again, suppose a special vestry meeting is to be held, in which some important temporal affair of the Church is to be discussed. Our canon is very particular in emphasizing the word temporal. Say the matter under discussion is the increase of the clergyman's stipend, or enlarging or improving the church or parsonage. Now these Presbyterians are the very ones the clergyman would like to have there: their liberality (for I have always found such "hearers" very liberal) would provoke to jealousy, it might be, those who boast of their being "members of the Church of England," but do nothing in her behalf. Yet such men, because they cannot sign the book, must be excluded, and the close-fisted, so-called members of the Church may come and vote upon the monetary affairs of the Church, to which they contribute little or nothing.

I think the principle adopted by the South African Church, the true one: viz., 1st., As the vestry is only concerned with the temporal affairs of the parish, all those who subscribe, and they only, should vote. 2. The Representatives to the Synod should be elected by communicants only, i.e., by those who communicate at least three times a year.

In the second case, instead of the "book to be kept for that purpose," the communicants' roll would form the voters' list, while in the former case representation by taxation would be the basis of all legislative action as to the temporal affairs of the individual parish.

Yours, &c.,

May 15th, 1882.

GEO. J. LOW.

#### HURON STANDING COMMITTEE.

SIR,—The Rev. F. Harding has given your readers another letter respecting the proposed canon emanating from the Standing Committee; it appeared in your issue of May 18th. How any person could commit himself in the way he has done, is a problem of difficult solution. He manifestly contradicts what he had written in his letter dated Easter Even, 1882. He there wrote, "the draft of the canon submitted by the Chancellor after full, manly, and independent discussion, was referred to the committee named in Mr. Wright's letter, to be presented, not at the evening, but at the ensuing session of the Synod." In his subsequent letter, dated May the 5th, he states that "the full text of this canon has not been brought into such a shape as to please the Standing Committee itself," and that "if it be not put into such a shape as to meet the views of the Committee, it will either not come before the Synod at all, or it must come under the patronage of some individual." He described the nature of the canon in his former letter, and very complacently declared that the gratitude of the whole Church would be merited by the Standing Committee, if it could be made to answer the purpose intended. What are we to understand by such contradictory statements? No wonder he hopes that further discussion of this matter should not take place in the public press. But why fear publicity of a matter deserving the gratitude of the whole Church? He complains that I manifested towards him an amount of personal bitterness quite uncalled for. I simply stated facts which he cannot refute, and which were the natural outcome of the description he gave of the canon. He declared it was to meet cases of false witness borne by a clergyman against his neighbour, and I openly charged the Standing Committee with having committed the offence, thereby having broken the commandment of their God: certainly this was *apropos* to the occasion. It was but a practical illustration of ministerial duty, and as necessary for the safety of others as for myself. Who would be safe in the power of such a body of men, having manifestly shewn a disregard for justice? I assert that the Standing Committee who took part in the proceedings of Dec. 8th, 1881, and of June 20th, 1881, stand convicted before the Church of an unjust, unprotestant, and unchristian proceeding, in accusing, judging, and passing sentence upon their neighbour, in his absence and without his knowledge, basing their action upon clear and palpable untruth. Why, even Judaism in its most degenerate days could find one at least to rebuke a council by asking, "doth our law judge any man before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" Personal bitterness indeed! Was there no personal bitterness in the cruel act of endeavouring, by false testimony, to injure a clergyman and his family? Unless honesty has forsaken the Church, it must stand aghast at such a proceeding. The exposure should be more "deserving of gratitude" than the framing of a canon which would be capable of dethroning the rights of conscience, and haunt the homes of men with the grim spectre of the torturing rack and thumb-screw of other days. To