

hazy doubts suggested; and, I think if we would but study, and be guided by that standard, we should be safe, and in meantime be spared a good deal of unnecessary and mischievous wrangling on the subject.

And, as a case in point. With all due deference to the correspondent I mention, I cannot but think that he would have done the cause better service if instead of using the precise words of his explanation, he had referred to the definition contained in the Catechism. Yours,
JOHN HOLGATE.
Toronto, Jan. 24th, 1890.

Patronage and Preferment.

SIR,—In your article on the above subject you well remark "There are few questions more perplexing and more difficult of solution than that which concerns the manner of appointing clergymen to parochial charges." The fact that the question so bristles with difficulties, and yet so urgently presses for a solution, should lead us to study it and discuss it in all its bearings in order that some uniform system of patronage may be thought out, and finally become law, which will be best adapted to the circumstances of the Canadian Church.

In theory the English system is perhaps undefensible, but practically it works well, one of the chief advantages of it being to my mind that it prevents a diocese or parish from becoming stereotyped either in thought or methods. And Bishop Ryle, of Liverpool, may be succeeded by a Bishop of the school of the Bishop of Lincoln, and Bishop King in turn may be succeeded by a man of the school of the late Dean Stanley. The same thing may occur in a parish, and it is by this fusion of the various schools of thought in the Church, and the moderating influence that they exert upon each other that in time the noblest type of Churchmanship will be evolved, and we shall have all that is good in each school retained, and all that is false or harmful will pass away. The English system of patronage like most things English is a growth and cannot be transplanted. The disadvantage of the elective mode of appointing bishops and pastors is that it tends to perpetuate party distinctions. A Bishop of pronounced party proclivities is elected, he uses all his influence to further the interests of his party, there is no limitation placed on his power as to whom he will ordain, receive into his diocese, or under our present system in Ontario appoint to a parish or dignity, and the consequence is not only many cases of individual injustice occur, but the Church is injured by one school of thought being unduly favored, and a diocese given up to one set of influences, and all that might widen or modify it is rigidly excluded. Given a partisan Bishop and a partisan Divinity College or school, in which to warp young minds and fashion them on the prevailing type and the extent of the mischief which our elective system, combined with episcopal patronage may work may easily be realized.

Episcopal patronage, except to a very limited extent, is unknown in the Anglican Communion. It is capable of being greatly abused. It would tend to foster the perpetuation of partisanship, and exists only in the Church of Rome. Our Bishops are not absolute but constitutional rulers. They are executive to enforce laws which have been passed by Provincial or Diocesan Synods in which Bishops, clergy and laity have an equal part. To place the entire patronage of a diocese in the hands of one man would be, as all attempts where many are concerned to raise up a one man power, most objectionable and harmful, and, as things are in the Canadian Church to say when the clergy and laity are admitted to take such a leading part in Church affairs, would be impossible to accomplish.

If not equally objectionable there are at least many objections to placing the appointment of a pastor in the hands of a congregation. No one will question that they should have a voice in the selection, and that their views and feelings should be considered. The difficulties in the way of a congregation making a choice are numerous. When left to them there is but one way open, that is to sample them. This necessitates the degrading system of trial sermons, degrading to the ministers of Christ, and demoralizing to the congregation. It is in full play in the Presbyterian Church in this country. I have recently had an opportunity of seeing it in operation in my neighbourhood. One Presbyterian congregation had thirty-six ministers in as many successive Sundays before they arrived at a choice. And another, quite a small congregation, had no less than forty-seven when I last heard of it, and was as far as ever from a decision. Objectionable as congregational choice is among the Presbyterians it would be still more so with us, for we should not have the check of the Presbytery which may refuse its sanction to the call of a congregation, and they have not those divisions as to doctrine and ritual which unhappily disturb our peace.

It is easier to take exception to existing methods than it is to suggest something better in their place.

The patronage of the Church belongs to the Church and should be bestowed by the Church for the promotion of its best interests. Its exercise should not be delegated to the Bishop nor to an interested congregation but Bishop, clergy and laity should have a voice in its distribution. This can only be done by representation. Let there be in each diocese a Board of Patronage consisting of the Bishop and representative clergy and laity elected annually as all other boards and committees are elected. Of this Board the Bishop would of course always be *ex officio* a member and President. It would naturally be composed of such leading and high-minded and fair-minded clergy and laity that justice would be done, and the best interests of the Church secured so far as by human means it can be secured. The bestowal of patronage is of interest to all the constitutional parts of the Church, and why should not the clergy have a voice in it, as well as the Bishop or an interested congregation. In this question the clergy have a deep interest. Oftentimes they only know their Bishop as a superior officer, and the Bishop only knows them in a very general way. The ideal of the Episcopal office, a *Father* in God, is not always realized. A clergyman does know his brother clergymen, and on such a board the clergy could elect such brethren as they could trust to represent them in so important a matter. Such a board could in all cases take a wise view of their duties, and keep before them the claims of all the clergy to promotion, their length of service and their usefulness as well as the needs of the parish. Before such a board a parish could appear by their representatives, and should such a board arrive at a decision contrary to the views of the parish they would much more likely acquiesce than if a pastor were imposed upon them by the Bishop or by a majority of their own members. A board of patronage should not be limited in their choice to the diocese for which they act, but should prefer the interests of the Church to any individual or set of individuals, and be at liberty to appoint any clergyman who in their judgment could best fill the vacant position.

The question of patronage is not one that should be dealt with in piecemeal fashion by Diocesan Synods, but one that should engage the attention and be controlled by the Provincial Synod. It is not desirable to have such diversity of practice as now prevails in the Ecclesiastical Province of Canada. In some dioceses we have popular election of rectors, in others absolute appointment by the Bishop, and in others the Bishop's power limited to the extent of conferring with the representatives of the congregation immediately interested.

Another matter that would facilitate the exercise of patronage and give a board of patronage a better opportunity of making a good appointment would be some arrangement whereby clergy could move from one diocese to another without sacrificing their interest in funds more particularly for Superannuation and Widows's and Orphan's, to which by long residence they have become entitled. But I must leave this for another letter at some future time.

Yours truly,

PRESBYTER.

Jan. 13, 1890.

Sunday School Lesson.

Sexagesima Sunday. Feb. 9th, 1890.

GOD THE SON.

I.—THE SON OF GOD.

Who is the first Person of the Trinity? Who is the second? Distinguish between the Sonship of Jesus Christ, and of baptized persons. Christ alone came forth from God. He is really God (Col. ii. 9). He is called the Word because He came forth from God. (S. John i. 1-5.) He is given another Divine Name in Rev. xix. 16.

We have learned that "No man hath seen God at any time." "God is a Spirit." Therefore, God the Son is Spirit. How did people see Him? He became incarnate, i.e., He took flesh. "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man." (S. John i. 14.)

II.—JESUS.

What name did the angel say the Son of Mary should bear? (S. Mat. i. 21.) Who had borne this name before? Joshua (which means "God the Saviour"). He is called Jesus (Acts vii. 45). [Explain character of Joshua's work, and show how he was a type of Jesus.]

III.—CHRIST.

Jesus is the name of the Incarnate Son of God, Christ suggests his office. What does "Christ" mean? It means "The Anointed." Acts iv. 27.) Jesus was anointed by the Holy Ghost. (S. Matt. iii. 16, 17.)

What sort of persons were anointed among the children of Israel? (1) Prophets, (2) Priests, (3) Kings. That is (1) those who had to teach, (2) those

who made sacrifice, (3) those who had to govern. Jesus anointed to all three offices.

(1) *Prophet*. What did Moses, the great teacher, say of the Saviour Who was to come? (Acts iii. 22, 23.) What did Nicodemus say? (S. John iii. 2.) The people found out that he was no common teacher. (S. Matt. vii. 28, 29.) He told His Apostles to continue the work. (S. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.)

(2) *Priest*. Duty of Priest (a) to offer sacrifices, (b) to pray for the people and (c) to bless them in God's name. The only sacrifice which can take away sin is the one, full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice offered by Christ Himself on the altar of the cross, (Heb. ix. 11, 12.) Our Lord still a priest, (Heb. vii. 21), for He never ceases to plead the "One Sacrifice." (Heb. vii. 25.) He still blesses His people through His ministers. (S. John xx. 21.)

(3) *King*. The Jews expected a King (S. Matt. ii. 6). See what Jesus says (S. John xviii. 36). His kingdom without end (S. Luke i. 33).

IV.—THE FRUIT OF THIS FAITH.

If we think, as we ought to do, of Jesus being Saviour, Teacher, Priest and King, then shall we love and serve Him, fighting manfully under His banner against the World, the Flesh and the Devil

Family Reading.

Devotional Notes on the Sermon on the Mount.

4.—THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

The promise, the blessing belonging to the poor in Spirit is the Kingdom of Heaven; and the general meaning of the phrase was pointed out in the exposition of the first Beatitude. But the idea pervades the whole Sermon on the Mount, and indeed is so prominent in the three synoptic Gospels, that it is desirable to obtain a fairly clear idea of its meaning. The different opinions entertained on the subject may be explained by the different applications of the term, although all these shades of meaning are referable to one fundamental conception.

Thus, the Kingdom of God certainly means the Church, although probably in its ideal aspect rather than in its actual form. It may also be used either of the present or future condition of the people of God, as the Kingdom of grace, or the Kingdom of glory, or both. It has also been explained to mean the sphere of the administration of the grace of God in Jesus Christ; and in other ways. How deep, how rich, how blessed are the thoughts which cluster around these Divine words!

Let us try to understand their origin and application. In S. Matthew, the phrase is most commonly, Kingdom of Heaven, in the other Gospels, Kingdom of God. We note the difference here without further dwelling upon it. The Kingdom of God, then, is the reign of God, and, in its simple sense, this extends over the whole universe. All things are made by Him, and He is Lord over all. There is a certain sense in which His will is always done, everywhere. Although clouds and darkness are now round about Him, we know that righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne. We know that the end, when it comes, will

"Assert eternal Providence,
And justify the ways of God to men."

There is, however, another sense in which the will of God is not perfectly done. Sin has invaded this world, at least, and whilst natural law has universal sway, as the law of necessity, moral law, as the law of liberty, is continually violated. But it is ever the purpose of God to win back this revolted domain. The great Doer of this work was the Lord Jesus, the Redeemer of the world. But there were preparations for His manifestation, and in the chief of these, the Jewish theocracy, the idea of the Kingdom was the explanation of its nature. The Jewish state was a Kingdom of God. Its laws were promulgated from heaven, and they were enforced by divine sanctions.

But the realization of the Kingdom in Judaism was very imperfect. The Law was a code of precepts which could never be complete. Its sanctions were, formally at least, external. Righteousness could not be by the Law. And besides all this, it was confined to one people. Such a restriction seemed good to Him for the better working out of His purpose towards all Mankind. But an arrangement of this kind was obviously of a temporary nature. The Most High must claim the

whole race, no Jewish Communion passed away.

The Prophet (God of Heaven) shall never be Matthew, writ Kingdom of God perhaps also to earthly representation over by the in throne of heaven reality to the Kingdom in His own He said, is am He also, in His harmony of th (God are perfect Yet, whilst

the Kingdom c ministry of Ch Day of Pentecost of the Kingdom Kingdom was the Day of Pent the Kingdom c great change h announcements had sat down and the Holy C to weld the disc that henceforth the Lord, but forth they are as The Church.

It is clear, t the Kingdom o living Church o professing the communion of and in breakin tain that the bl subjects of the the Church in i names of "Sain to all members only to those w in the full sense

Here is the which have oft expositors on th baptized man be baptized person of the Kingdom the whole teach The Kingdom o its members or righteousness of God is righteous Ghost. These in the Kingdom ended in their The poor in Spi tion for admissi privileges, and of glory.

PROPER USE proper vegetable of vegetables n green peas are n or poultry. Co or poultry. W bage, apple sav should be serv cheese should al peas and waterc turnips, cabbage

POTTED HAM. very fine with a what is left after the table. Mix cold water unt boiling water. in the ham with When well mixe

Ox HEART.—