

The Church Times.

"Evangelical Truth—Apostolic Order."

VOL. 5. HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 1857. NO. 37.

Calendar.

CALENDAR WITH LESSONS.

Day/Date	MORNING	EVENING.
S. Sept. 18	Jerem. 6	Mat. 24
M. 19	Nahum 3	16 Habak. 1
W. 20	16 Habak. 3	19 Zeph. 1
Th. 21	Zeph. 1	18 Haggai 1
F. 22	Haggai 1	19 Zech. 1
S. 23	Zech. 2	20

* One of the Ember Week Services to be used on this day and each day in this week.

Poetry.

WHOM DOES THE LORD LOVE BEST?

THREE brothers lingering in a wood,
Conversed on heavenly things;
When in their path an angel stood,
With splendor flashing wings.

"Who careth most for God?" she asked—
"Thou with the haughty brow,
What would'st thou give to win His love,
If he were present now?"

"Of gems a thousand sparkling stones,
Of jewels all I own,
And if I had a hundred thrones,
They should be His alone."

The second eager spoke—"And I,
Would bring him lands and gold,"
The third abashed, stood trembling by,
Nor dared his gift unfold.

Her azure eye the angel turned
Full on his shrinking form,
He knew his soul with fervor burned,
His heart with love was warm.

He murmured, "Lo! I am not fit,
To look upon Thy face,
My brothers have both wealth and wit,
And much of heavenly grace.

"And I, alas! am weak and poor,
With little worldly pelf;
Yet, if He could the gift endure,
I'd gladly give—myself."

"Thou art," I heard the angel say,
"More blessed than the rest—
For whoso gives himself away,
Him the Lord loveth best."

Religious Miscellany.

THE CANADIAN ELECTION.

THE time has not long past when it would have been thought wholly incredible that any diocese in communion with the Church of England, and subject to the British Crown, should, with the full sanction of Government, elect its own Bishop. Not indeed that such a consequence could be resisted, as a matter of theory, by those who had adopted the modern political doctrine of the absolute indifference of the State in religious matters. Yet so strong was the Herastian instinct of politicians, so powerful the apprehension of anything which might tend to weaken the influence of statesmen over the Church at home, that the notion of conceding an Episcopal election to a colony was treated as chimerical by practical men—by none more so than by those who were the eager claimants for the non-interference of the State with Nonconformist bodies. The concession which Canada has at last obtained would probably have been deferred for another generation, but for the complication arising out of the confiscation of the Clergy Reserves in those provinces. The arguments by which that measure was recommended to the Imperial Parliament were grounded on the exclusive right of the colonists to the management of their own affairs. When the right had once been allowed, and the unimpeachable title of the Church to her estates had been destroyed in deference to its claim, it was impossible to deny its existence, because it might now subvert her spiritual independence as much as it had lately injured her temporal prosperity. So the Churchmen of Upper Canada have lost their lands and gained the power to elect their own Bishops. Whether the balance be one of gain or loss is not, perhaps, so absolutely clear as at first sight the partisans of opposite schools will be ready to decide. So far as the election over which the venerable Bishop of Toronto has just presided can be taken

as an illustration of the consequences of this important change, there is much to be argued from it on both sides. Plainly there was an antagonism of parties among the electors, and, it would seem, something of the bitterness which a party contest never fails to provoke. High Church and Low Church had their representative candidates, for whom theological leaders put forth all their efforts. On the other hand it is evident that, with the close of the election, ended the animosity of its rival interests. The leading supporters of Dr. Bethune came forward to propose a unanimous vote of the Synod in favour of Dr. Cronyn, the Bishop-elect. It can hardly be doubted that the defeated minority left the church in which the election was decided against them with less feeling of hardship than they would have cherished if the Bishop whom they opposed had been the nominee of a latitudinarian Minister of State.

A more serious subject of reflection arises from the diversity apparent between the two estates of clergy and laity in their choice. In this instance, indeed, there was a very slight preponderance of the clerical vote on the same side with the decisive majority of the laity; but had the small number, by which that vote was determined, inclined the other way, a conflict of sentiments would have arisen, which all good Churchmen must have earnestly deprecated. Should the practice obtain of electing Bishops contrary to the voice of the clergy, we do not see that the welfare of that order would be more secured by popular election than it has been by the English system of Ministerial nomination. We may trust, indeed—and this is all that can be said—that no body of lay representatives would pursue the policy which, from Sir Robert Walpole downwards, Whig statesmen have adopted, of promoting to the high places of the Church divines who did not speak the sentiments or command the confidence of the clergy over whom they were to preside.

The advocates of popular election for our Bishops go a little too far when they claim for such a proceeding as the recent Synod at London the direct sanction of primitive Christianity. They should remember that only half the precedent has been followed in the Canadian election. The clergy and laity, by themselves or their representatives, were indeed consulted; but the assent of the provincial Bishops, and the confirmation of the Metropolitan were left out. Possibly these checks were often worthless, generally matters of form in early times; but that they did sometimes furnish a wholesome corrective to the haste or intemperance of a popular assembly is sufficiently clear. The circumstances of some of our Colonies, especially in Australia, are such as to render an ecclesiastical check peculiarly desirable; yet it is in that region that the Canadian precedent is most likely to be urged, and without the safeguards by which in a semi-civilized population it ought undoubtedly to be restrained. We cannot but think that the assent of the Bishops of the province, harmonising as it does with primitive practice, would be a desirable condition of all Episcopal elections to Colonial Sees. At all events, a confirmation by the Metropolitan of the province ought to be retained; and for that purpose, as well as for others, each group of colonies ought at once to receive its provincial character, and be subordinated to its own primate. We need hardly add that a colonial confirmation ought not to be, and could not be, the mockery of that important judicial proceeding to which civilians and crown lawyers have contrived to reduce it at home.

We have written with some little abatement from the tone of exultation with which Canadian Churchmen describe their recent ecclesiastical achievement. It is well to be aware of the dangers, as well as the advantages, attending any untried course. Yet, on the whole, we cannot but congratulate the members of the Church of England in the diocese of Toronto on what they have done. With little aid from the mother country, they have raised an endowment nearly sufficient to provide for a much needed bishopric; they have gained the subdivision of an unmanageable diocese, and emancipated themselves from all political dictation in the appointment of the Diocesan. It is plain that there was a real interest in the work, or these things could not have been done. They may not unfairly turn round upon us,

and ask how long we meant to be content with the confession that Cornwall and Northumberland need each its separate Bishop, and that our own London has (far more than theirs) outgrown the possibility of one Prelate's Episcopal supervision, without taking any step to remedy the evils we acknowledge. As to the more delicate question of appointments to such new Sees as we can be stirred up to found, we must be content to set the American precedent aside as not quite applicable to our circumstances, and pray that the day of their erection may see the country governed by a Minister better qualified by his knowledge of religious affairs, and still more by his conviction of their importance, than the flippant actor on the political stage who now orders them so ill.—*London Guardian.*

THE FEAR OF GOD.—At one part of the sermon he stopped me, that he might meditate on what he had heard, and then he said, "Read it again." When I had finished it, "This," said he "exactly expresses what I would say to you; that is just my sentiment." I have copied the passage:—

"The fear of God is not a perplexing doubting, and distrust of his love; on the contrary, it is a fixed resting and trusting in his love. Many who have some truth and grace are, through weakness, filled with disquieting fears; but, possibly, though they perceive it not, it may be in some a point of wilfulness, a little latent, undiscerned affectation of scrupling and doubting, placing much of religion in it. True, where the soul is really solicitous about its interests in God, that argues some grace; but being vexingly anxious about it, argues that grace is weak and low. A spark there is discovered even by the smoke; but the great smoke still continuing, and nothing seen but it, argues there is little fire, little faith, little love; and then as it is unpleasant to thyself, so it is to God as smoke to the eyes. What if one should be always questioning with a friend, whether he loved him or not, and upon every little occasion were ready to think he doth not, how would they disrelish each other? The far more excellent way, and more pleasing both to ourselves and God, were to resolve on humble trust, reverence, and confidence, being most afraid to offend, delighting to walk in His ways, loving Him and His will in all; and then resting persuaded of His love, though He chastise us, and even though we offend Him, and see our offence in our chastisements, yet He is good; plenteous in redemption, ready to forgive; therefore let Israel hope and trust. Let my soul reel itself on him, and adventure there all its weight. He bears greater matters, upholding the frame of heaven and earth, and is not troubled nor burdened with it."—*Leigh Richmond's Memoirs.*

THE PROHIBITED BOOK.

Bedell was in the habit of repeating a passage in a sermon, which he had heard Fulgentio preach at Venice, on this text, "Have ye not read?" The divine told his audience, that if Christ were now to ask them that question, all the answer they could make, would be, "No, Lord! we are not suffered to do so!" On which he zealously descanted on the restraint put on the use of Scripture by the Romanists. This Fulgentio was a Minorite friar, and the intimate friend of Father Paul. He preached in so enlightened and scriptural a manner, that Pope Paul the Fifth is reported to have said of his discourses, "He has indeed some good sermons, but bad ones withal; he stands too much upon Scripture, which is a book that if any man will keep close to, he will quite ruin the Catholic faith."—On one occasion, when preaching on Pilate's question, "What is truth?" he told his audience that he had been long searching for it, and had at last found it. "Here it is in my hand!" He held up a New Testament, but as soon as the people had seen, he returned it to his pocket, observing dryly, "The book is prohibited." He took part in the Venetian controversy against the Pontiff, but was induced by the Nuncio to visit Rome, on promise of safe conduct. He was at first received with favor, and even with festivity, but his entertainers finished their kindness by burning him alive!