

A. When He gave His Body to be broken, and His Blood to be shed for the remission of sins. St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27.

When by His own Blood He entered in once into the Holy Place, having obtained eternal redemption for us. Heb. ix. 11, 12.

And He still exercises His office, as "a priest for ever," by His perpetual intercession in heaven, by offering up to God the prayers and Eucharists of the Church, and by blessing her with all spiritual blessings from God.

Q. Does He help us only by Himself, or by means of others?

A. Both ways: From God secretly as He sees fit; and through the ministers of His Church. [It is He who really baptizes, confirms, absolves, feeds us with His Body and Blood.]

Q. Where does He say that He does these things by means of others?

A. In Matt. x. 40; St. John xx. 21, 23; St. Matt. xviii. 18. See also 1 Cor. v. 4; 2 Cor. ii. 10. And compare St. John iv. 1, 2; St. Matt. xiv. 19; 1 Cor. x. 16.

Q. How must we honour Christ as our Priest?

A. By firmly believing that by "His one oblation of Himself once offered, He made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world;" by coming boldly to the throne of grace through Him, (Heb. iv. 14, 15, 16; and by expecting that as an ever present Priest He will bless us by His ministers in all the means of grace.

Q. What other office is He anointed to bear?

A. That of King. St. John xviii. 37; i. 49.

Q. Was this foretold by the prophets?

A. Yes: in Ps. ii. 6; Jer. xxiii. 5; St. Luke i. 32, 33.

Q. What is the extent of His kingdom?

A. It is unbounded. St. Matt. xxviii. 18.

Q. How do we honour Him as King?

A. 1. By obeying His word. 2. By submitting to all His dispensations—for as Mediator He orders all things. 3. By regarding Him as the fountain of all true power, and seeking honour from Him alone. 4. By making Him offerings of our substance, as the Magi, (St. Matt. ii. 11). As King, He will say in the last day, "Come, ye blessed, for I was an hungred, and ye gave Me meat." St. Matt. xxv. 34, 35.

Correspondence.

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

APPEAL.

DEAR SIR,—Having been recently appointed by the Bishop of Algoma, as lay missionary in charge of the mission at Tarentorus, I would crave the indulgence of a short space in your next issue, to bring forward some of the most urgent needs of this much neglected little village.

With a population of nearly, or quite, 200 souls, this little place has never enjoyed more than a fortnightly service at the most; and, for nearly a twelvemonth, even these have been discontinued; but now, under the energetic regime of our beloved Bishop prospects are looking brighter, and these poor people are to have Sunday-school and service regularly (D. V.) every Sunday. But, and here is our difficulty, we have no proper sanctuary in which we can offer up our sacrifice of prayer and praise, and so these poor folk are compelled to appeal to the rich amongst their brethren to aid them in their earnest endeavour to erect a suitable building for the worship of Almighty God. To show that the people are themselves willing to do what they can, I may mention that one man has offered an acre of land to be deeded to the Bishop for the church and churchyard; and another member of the congregation 1,000 feet of lumber; others, so many weeks work; and others again, sums from one to ten dollars. Each child in the Sunday-school promised to collect at least one dollar before Christmas; but with all this, they still require something like \$800 more.

Will not the charitably disposed amongst the members of Christ's flock, who have experienced the blessed privilege of worshipping their Creator and Redeemer in a building meet to be called "the house of prayer," aid this poor but loyal flock, away in the backwoods of Algoma, to secure the same blessed privilege for themselves? Surely, yes! And, oh! with what pleasure will this little band of Churchmen welcome their Bishop on his return next spring, if they can say, "Our church is built, free from debt, and now awaits consecration at your Lordship's convenience."

I have the permission of Mrs. O'Reilly, Secretary-treasurer of the C. W. M. A., 31 Bleeker street, Toronto, to say that she will be most happy to receive contributions of money towards the church, or of articles for a Christmas tree, or of books for a Sunday-school library, all of which Mrs. O'Reilly has kindly promised to forward before the close of navigation.

With many apologies for trespassing so long upon your valuable space,

I am yours very obediently,

J. H. GLASS,
Shingwauk Home, Theological Student,
Sault Ste. Marie, Oct. 7th, 1882.

P. S. I may add that our good Bishop has very kindly given \$25 towards our church. All contributions, however small, whether sent to Mrs. O'Reilly or to myself direct, will be gratefully acknowledged per return mail.

ANONYMOUS WRITING AND THE THIRD CLAUSE OF THE AMENDED CANON—RE THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CLERGY.

SIR,—The practice of anonymous writing is associated with grave evils, but also possesses many redeeming features. As a general rule, perhaps it is better to avoid the practice, especially in a religious newspaper, in which people are expected to write from a high sense of duty and in a Christian spirit. Viewing the matter in this aspect, I think you are wise in refusing all anonymous letters, and the result has been to make the correspondence department of the DOMINION CHURCHMAN so interesting and weighty an exponent of Church thought and Church work, that it has become a common saying that the correspondence alone is worth the annual subscription.

But it would be the greatest folly to say that all anonymous writing is reprehensible. There are innumerable cases when it may not only be justifiable, but absolutely necessary. Half a score of reasons may arise when the interests of truth and justice will be far better served by this means than by open writing. Of this, history furnishes us with many examples, notably in the case of the Letters of Junius, and of innumerable pamphlets and books of the present age.

And it is very easy to see how this can be. It is very often desirable in the interests of fair-play and calm, unbiassed judgment, to dissociate the writer and the production. We know that in the case of well-known men, whether eminent or otherwise, that it is very seldom their writings are judged upon their own merits. This is true more or less of every one who is known at all. But with anonymous writings this is different, they are judged upon their own intrinsic merits, and, if weighted with the authority of truth, are really more worthy of respect than if weighted with the name of the author however eminent. Under these circumstances, therefore, it may be often not only desirable or expedient, but essentially necessary in the interests of truth that the name of the writer be withheld, so that the matter be not prejudged.

Again, it may be, that from timidity, hatred of publicity, or lack of moral courage, a man may adopt a disguise. We know that some of the best and ablest men are constitutionally averse to publicity, and that were it not for this shield the world would have lost some of the best and ablest literary productions ever penned. Is it not, therefore, better in the interests of truth and justice that a man should in this way bring wrong, falsehood and oppression to light, even if he is not man enough to do it openly. This is a choice of evils. I do not mean to say that I would adopt such a plan myself, and I am not prepared to say that under all circumstances I would not; but be this as it may, *fiat justitia ruat cælum*.

Again, secrecy may be necessary in self-defence. There are many modes of oppression, even in this year of grace, and a man may for his own sake and those near and dear to him, be compelled to fire from behind a wall, if by this means he can effectually combat and destroy wrong. It would be absurd to say that under such circumstances a man had better let evil go unchallenged.

I might multiply instances, illustrating my point, but these are sufficient to prove that those who denounce all anonymous writings under all circumstances, are either deliberately blinding themselves to the truth, or are so contracted and narrow in their perceptions that their opinion is worth little, if anything. Of course, for those who, to gratify personal spite, slander anonymously, I have nothing but the supremest contempt. Anonymous writing is only justifiable under special circumstances, which are, however, continually arising; but whenever expedient open writing should be resorted to, just as a brave general would sooner fight in the open field, but when outnumbered and outmanœuvred will be glad to avail himself of fortifications.

It is not difficult therefore to see that any interference with the perfect freedom of the press must necessarily be a most dangerous thing. There are, no doubt—as in all human institutions—evils inseparable from the liberty of the press as understood in the British empire in the nineteenth century, but we know from experience that the present state of things is incomparably supine to a fettered press such as existed even one hundred years ago. And while we speak of the "liberty of the press," it is well to remember that by the law of libel a sharp and sure

restraint is put upon anything that may be called licence.

On the grounds, as set forth in the first part of this letter and specially indicated in these remarks immediately foregoing, I have opposed and always will oppose the third clause of this amended canon on Discipline, lately passed in Huron Synod, viz., that relating to the publication of anonymous pamphlets.

I may briefly summarize my objections to the clause as follows. 1. It is an assumption of infallibility on the part of the "duly constituted authorities of the Church," branding, as it does, all adverse criticism as "contumacious;" or if not of infallibility, at least of irresponsibility to public opinion. 2. It violates the first principles of justice, by making the plaintiff the judge of his own cause. This is easily seen. By the same canon the triers of a clergyman for any offence, are to be chosen from the clerical members of the Standing Committee. If a clergyman, therefore, slanders the Standing Committee he is tried by the Standing Committee. This is a terrible power to put into the hands of a body of men. If any criticism should happen to displease them they can brand it as libellous, and depose the writer from his sacred office. To them alone is left the definition of "contumacy," and their power is practically unlimited.

3. The clause is enacted not to meet a wide-spread evil, but strikes at a single individual. On Herod's principal therefore, when he slaughtered the innocents, i. e., the less being contained in the greater, the whole clergy of the diocese of Huron are subjected to an obnoxious and impertinent regulation. That is to say, the one hundred and twenty odd are insulted and oppressed for the sins of one. Reversing the old adage, they "venture a whale to catch a sprat."

4. It goes beyond the law of the land. Ample provision for redress in case of libel is made in this way, with the attendant advantages of publicity, authority, and fair play. Why then shun publicity and arouse the suspicion in the Church and world at large of injustice, by making a clergyman subject to such a tribunal for such an offence. If the clause had read "all persons duly convicted, by law, of publishing malicious libels on the duly constituted authorities, shall be liable to deposition," there could have been no reasonable ground for objection. What is the law on this subject? It is this—if you publish lies about a man you can be punished, if the truth, you can not. What more does the diocese want than this? Do the framers of this canon want to punish for speaking the truth?

5. It is opposed to the freedom which is the pride and glory of the English Church. 6. Last and best, it can never be any more than a dead letter, and is not worth the paper it is written on.

Such are the main reasons which have prompted me to oppose this amended canon. I offer no capacious opposition because I am by nature a most peaceable man, ready to make a good many sacrifices to avoid trouble; but this is more than I can endure, and I feel it my bounden duty to enter my respectful but firm protest against this most un-English interference with the liberty of the press and the clergy.

In conclusion, I hope that our next Synod will repeal this obnoxious clause, and that the scores of clergy who are so bitterly opposed to the clause will be straightforward enough to vote it down, and not avoid the point at issue, as they did on this last occasion. Thanking you for your courtesy in publishing this lengthy letter,

Believe me to remain

Very truly yours,

R. F. DIXON.

The Parsonage,
Bothwell, Ont.

HERE IN OUR OWN TERRITORY.—It can almost be asserted that St. Jacobs Oil works wonders. Shortly before the New Year, when I visited my family in Mitchell, I found my son Edward, a lad little more than ten years old, very sick. He suffered with rheumatism, and so terribly, that he was perfectly stiff in his limbs, could not possibly walk, and had to be carried from place to place. At once I sent for some St. Jacobs Oil, used it according to directions, and in a few days could see evidence of considerable improvement. On the tenth of this month I again visited my family, and was astonished to find him well and hearty. He once more has fresh colour in his face, and can go to school again. Whenever the old trouble threatens to return relief is immediately secured by the use of the celebrated St. Jacobs Oil. From sheer joy over this result I cannot withhold recommending St. Jacobs Oil to suffering humanity as a true benefactor. CHARLES METZDORF, office of the *Volksfreund*, German paper of Stratford, Ont.

FEAR NOT.—All kidney and urinary complaints especially Bright's Disease, Diabetes, and Liver troubles, Hop Bitters will surely and lastingly cure. Cases exactly like your own have been cured in your own neighbourhood, and you can find reliable proof at home of what Hop Bitters has and can do.