

Dominion Churchman.

THE ORGAN OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND IN CANADA.

DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS.

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly from the post-office, whether directed in his name or another's, or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible for payment.
2. If a person orders his paper discontinued, he must pay all arrears, or the publisher may continue to send it until payment made, and then collect the whole amount, whether the paper taken from the office or not.
3. In suits for subscriptions, the suit may be instituted in the place where the paper is published, although the subscriber may reside hundreds of miles away.
4. The courts have decided that refusing to take newspapers or periodicals from the post-office, or removing and leaving them uncalled for, while unpaid, is "prima facie" evidence of intentional fraud.

THE DOMINION CHURCHMAN is Two Dollars a Year. If paid strictly, that is promptly in advance, the price will be one dollar; and in no instance will this rule be departed from. Subscribers at a distance can easily see when their subscriptions fall due by looking at the address label on their paper. The Paper is sent until ordered to be stopped. (See above decisions.)

The "Dominion Churchman" is the organ of the Church of England in Canada, and is an excellent medium for advertising—being a family paper, and by far the most extensively circulated Church journal in the Dominion.

Frank Weetten, Proprietor, & Publisher,
Address: P. O. Box 9640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E.
West of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN BAKER, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY DAYS.

Nov. 17th.—TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.
Morning.—Daniel 6. Hebrews 10, 19.
Evening.—Dan. 7, 9; or 12. John 5, 24.

THURSDAY NOV. 14, 1889.

The Rev. W. H. Wadleigh is the only gentleman travelling authorized to collect subscriptions for the "Dominion Churchman."

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All matter for publication of any number of DOMINION CHURCHMAN should be in the office not later than Thursday for the following week's issue.

ADVICE TO ADVERTISERS.—The Toronto Saturday Night in an article entitled "Advertising as a Fine Art" says, that the DOMINION CHURCHMAN is widely circulated and of unquestionable advantage to judicious advertisers.

A quantity of Correspondence and Diocesan News unavoidably left over for want of space.

SINGING PRAYERS.—The recent scenes in and outside a church in Ottawa were the result, we must believe, of some grievous misunderstanding which has, we hope, been cleared up, or soon will be. Much as we prefer a musical rendering of our service, we infinitely prefer harmony in the worshippers. It is reported in the local papers that the chief objection to the service, the one indeed which moved certain persons to abruptly quit the church, was the introduction of the almost universal custom of singing the responses to the Commandments. A distinguished member of that church is said to have remarked, "I do not want the choir to sing my prayers for me." Surely this is wrong, for do not choirs all through the service sing prayers even if nothing is sung but hymns, as they are chiefly prayers? That any individual worshipper is

in any way prevented saying his own prayers because of the same prayers being sung by other worshippers, is hardly correct. Are there not in all congregations many who cannot sing at all? Are they therefore prevented praising God and supplicating His mercy and blessings while others are singing parts of the liturgy and the hymns? The objection made that the private prayer of non-singers is prevented by the singing of those musically inclined, will not bear examination—it has not a shadow of foundation. The objection to prayers being sung as we have dealt with before, but may repeat, that if prayers cannot be sung as well, that is, as earnestly as said, then the Jews of olden time and to-day were and are living without prayers, because their custom was, and is to sing their prayers both in private and public worship. And persons now gifted with a fine musical ear, and musical voice, are by this rule incapable of prayer, because such persons unconsciously, and instinctively, sing in all their utterances! Indeed we may go further, and declare that no man can speak without singing to some extent. A quick ear detects the passage from one note to another of all voices, badly as the vocal organ may be used by its owner, and crude and unmusical as may be his speaking, when judged from the standpoint of musical art. We trust a little reflection on one side, and conciliation on both, will bring this Ottawa matter to a happy termination. But those who will not pray while others are singing their prayers should prepare for a great surprise in Heaven! What will their fate be if they rush out of the Temple above, as they did out of the earthly one, because of their dislike to singing? In the alternative place there is no music, we believe, and it is the only place where it is absent!

THE JESUITS CELEBRATE GUNPOWDER PLOT DAY.—Considering the fact that the 5th of November is celebrated, and ever will be remembered, as the day upon which by God's goodness the Jesuits were frustrated in their design to destroy the members of the English House of Parliament at one blow, it was a scandalous piece of indecency for them to select that day upon which they were to receive the public money, owned by the Queen and people of Canada, which the Pope had assigned to them through the Jesuits Estates Act. That day was chosen in order to fling an insult to those who demand that in Canada all citizens and all religious bodies shall have Equal Rights. This contemptuous, scornful sneer at a great national anniversary will, however, only give another reason for remembering "Gunpowder Plot Day." It may result in reviving this patriotic celebration in Canada.

A WORD ABOUT ARCHBISHOP LAUD.—The most recent work of rank on English history, Gardiner's "History of the Great Civil War," has a passage relating to Archbishop Laud which is worth the attention of those who have been led by half informed writers to regard that great man as he was regarded by those enemies of the Church by whom he was so cruelly murdered. The Quarterly Review says, "The charge brought against Laud that he had a design to reduce England to the Roman obedience is without a grain of evidence." The charge is, however, yet made as though it were beyond question! Mr. Gardiner writes, "Laud was charged with being an innovator." Here his accusers appear to have been no less guilty than himself. What innovation can have been greater than the overthrow of Episcopacy and the substitution of extempore devotions for the Book of Common Prayer? It is no child's task to form a fair judgment of one placed in the times and circumstances of the martyred Archbishop, when the Church of England was assailed so dangerously on the one hand by Presbyterians and Independents, as much for political as for religious reasons, and on the other by the Church of Rome. A Church-

man in this age who finds any satisfaction in abusing Archbishop Laud, lays himself open to a suspicion of being at heart in sympathy with those who set Episcopacy aside and suppressed the Prayer Book.

THE SECRET OF THE POWER OF ROME.—The Bishop of Rochester in his last address said, "It may be useful for us to see how our great antagonist, Rome, is never off her guard, never loses heart, never pretends that religious differences do not matter, never doubts her own system, or permits others to think she doubts it, never pretends to hide what she is and what she claims, labors and waits for disciples, too often without scruple, with a wariness, a patience, and a resolution which go far to explain the secret of her gains from other Communion, and afford a lesson which we in some respects might do well to learn."

It is said of Cromwell by the ablest historian of his period that his success was owing to his clear conception of what he aimed to secure and his unwavering confidence in his power to attain it. Unstable men and unstable churches must in the nature of things make way for the strong and decided.

AN EVANGELICAL VIEW OF VOWS.—The Bishop quoted above, who is a thorough Evangelical, speaking of the proposed revival of brotherhoods, which some have spoken of as a return to monasticism, says in regard to vows:

"What is there in vows, abstractedly considered, inconsistent with the precept or doctrine of Holy Scripture, or at variance with the best interests of society, or in opposition to the needs of human nature, or out of harmony with the ordinances of the Church, or foreign to the spiritual history of great saints, whether of the Old or New Testament times?"

"As a matter of fact, the Bible record is full of vows of all kinds, and instead of deprecating or forbidding them, it recognises, sanctions, and regulates them. Civil society, under the analogous form of oath, insists on them as obligatory for the graver affairs of life. So far from only hurting or maiming human nature, they are again and again found to be a prop and help to its infirmities, because a support against the inevitable reactions of generous emotion. Indeed, if they were found of no value, they would disappear. At Baptism, and Confirmation, and Holy Matrimony, and Ordination, the Church in the most distinct and public manner possible recognises the importance of vows for life, and refuses to admit to her greatest ordinances without them. The great Apostle of the Gentiles, St. Paul himself, did not think it inconsistent, even with his liberty in Christ and his freedom from the yoke of the law, to make a vow, and keep it. It was that vow which sent him to bear witness at Rome."

Here another question occurs. If Christian people really feel that vows help them to great and lasting sacrifices, and that they keep the flame of enthusiasm burning in the heart, what right have we to interfere with their personal liberty, or sternly to tell them that they wish to bring back Romanism? "Promise" is also a liturgical word, and, if not thought feeble, might be an acceptable substitute for "vow."

ANOTHER UNSTABLE PERVERT.—Cardinal Manning has been informed by the Rev. H. Greene, O.C.R., a grandson of the late Canon Greene, of Bristol Cathedral, and a somewhat recent convert to the Church of Rome, that in consequence of his Eminence's refusal to administer to him—conditionally or otherwise—the customary Sacrament of Confirmation, he feels it incumbent upon him to withdraw from the Roman Catholic communion.

THE more of what is termed worldly wisdom man has, the less heavenly wisdom he possesses.