

# 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 uncollected 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 Weston, Proprietor, & Publisher,  
Address: P. O. Box 2640.

Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E.  
West of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN BAKER, Advertising Manager.

## LESSONS FOR SUNDAYS AND HOLY DAYS.

Mar. 10th.—FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT.  
Morning.—Gen. 12 to 30. Mark 9, 30.  
Evening.—Gen. 22 to v. 20; or 23. 1 Cor. 5.

THURSDAY, MAR. 7, 1889.

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

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.

## 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.

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

ON CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.—Commenting upon the views of two prominent Wesleyan ministers, the Revs. Joseph Agar Beet, and Benjamin Gregory, D.D., in relation to Christian baptism, as expressed in two recently-published works of theirs, *The Methodist Recorder* says:—"With all this we heartily sympathize, but fail to see why Dr. Gregory should protest elsewhere against the idea of grace as an imparted gift, contending that 'grace given always implies in the New Testament a consciously realised power' (p. 51). We understand the protest in its context, in relation to High Church dogmas, but surely grace may be given where it is not consciously realised. Surely when our Lord took little children into His arms—most of them, at least, 'unconscious' of what was happening to them—and 'blessed them,' the blessing was not the mere utterance of words of benediction? Surely the 'preventing grace' for which we daily pray is not always 'a consciously realised power,' and tens of thousands of God's gifts of grace are bestowed upon us without our conscious realisation? If it be said that regeneration cannot be imparted without the consciousness of the recipient, and

that we have no warrant for supposing that converting grace will be, or even could be, imparted to an unconscious infant, we fully agree. But we prefer to follow Dr. Gregory in the line of exposition quoted in the last paragraph, and to suppose that in the latter quotations we have misunderstood, or somewhat strained, his meaning. For surely if the basis of Christian baptism be what Dr. Gregory and Mr. Beet alike declare it to be, it is not "a mere formal recognition" of the great facts of redemption, entailing deeper responsibility, but conferring no privilege, imparting no blessing? If it be, as we believe, a duty of Christian parents thus to bring their children to God, surely there is privilege and blessing for the offspring, in response to prayer, and faith and dedication? The "favourable" allowing of the "godly work" does not mean that God permits the act, but no more; or enjoins it, without at the same time bestowing blessing in proportion to the faithful discharge of duty. And why should our just shrinking from Anglican sacramentalism lead us to denude this holy and blessed rite of significance in relation to the child presented, as well as in relation to the parents presenting? Cannot God bless unconscious infants, and surround them with grace from the very dawning of consciousness, and would it not be out of all keeping with the "God of all grace," if just here, where parents are most anxious and most helpless, His grace were withheld?

THE CHURCH AND AMUSEMENTS.—The Rev. W. H. Bullock, chaplain of the Forces, in a lecture on 'The Church and Amusements,' protested against adding to the Decalogue. We have no doubt that he gave his audience some much-needed warnings on the subject of amusements, but this protest of his seems to have especially attracted the reporter's attention. The Dean of Rochester endorsed every word of the lecture, and some thousands of people will do the same. 'Thou shalt not play cards,' 'Thou shalt not drink a glass of wine,' and 'Thou shalt not dance.' These are commandments which no one has a right to insist on all his neighbours observing. And yet we believe that many a parish priest finds himself saying—to one and another—In your case cards are to be avoided; in yours, the theatre or the ball; while for you, your only chance is to become a total abstainer. There need be no harm in whist, waltzing, or wine, but there very often is, as parochial clergy know very well.—*Church Bells.*

A POINT OF ETIQUETTE.—The *Jamaica Churchman* publishes a letter from the Bishop of the diocese, in which he gives his opinion on an interesting point of etiquette in the colonial Church. He writes:—"When I was about to be consecrated Bishop of Jamaica I sought advice from the highest source as to my own style and title; and in doing so I stated that my personal preference was for the simpler style adopted by our brethren in the United States. I was informed that the matter had been carefully gone into when advice was asked some time before in a similar case; and I was advised that the diocese of Jamaica having been created by Royal Letters Patent, which patent remains unrevoked, it would be proper to sign my Christian name and surname; and that it would be proper for me to receive and use the title 'Lord Bishop of Jamaica.' Being so advised I have acted accordingly. But I have made all my friends understand that I should be glad if they would reserve the title 'My Lord,' for use in formal documents and on official occasions. I have felt, and still feel, that to be addressed in personal conversation by comparative strangers as 'Dr. Nuttall,' and by my brethren and friends 'Bishop,' and in correspondence by the title as 'Right Reverend,' is, in each case, all that the most perfect courtesy demands; and to me, at least, the designation 'Bishop' is more honourable than the title 'My Lord.' I know that many of my colonial brethren think as I do.

Having so few titled persons in Canada our people are apt to get sadly astray in these matters. It seems in England to come naturally to address the titled both personally and by letter correctly, but opportunities of hearing what is right on such points do not exist here. The usual mistake is to fancy the words, "My Lord" are proper at every sentence, and that "His Lordship," is required by etiquette and courtesy whenever the title "Bishop" is used. All this is wrong. In addressing a nobleman in person or by letter, the usage is to recognise his rank at the beginning, and afterwards as seldom as possible, unless you wish to show how extraordinary an event it is for you to speak to a titled person, or to display your sycophancy. English papers do not say "His Lordship, the Earl of—this or that," but "Lord so and so." It is bad taste to display an anxiety to be ostentatiously respectful by repeating conventional phrases such as "My Lord," and "His Lordship," or "Your Lordship." No titled person of any sense is hurt by a little deficiency in this respect, but an excess of it is offensive.

ROME ON THE DECLINE.—We gave last year, the figures from an article in the *Quarterly Review* for January, 1888, proving that the numbers of Romanists in England has for about thirty years been on the decline. These figures have not been discredited by any Roman Catholic organ. If we take the Catholic Directory for last year we find their numbers still diminishing. The normal increase of population in England last year was one in 75, but the Romanists only increased at the rate of one in 225, this, too, in spite of the notoriously prolific Irish element in that body. They really lost 12,000 members in 1888. The number of perverts who have returned is also noticeable, the latest being the Rev. Vernon William Russell, B. A., formerly curate of Aghade, diocese of Leighlin, and who succeeded to the Church of Rome, who read his recantation, and on the Feast of the Epiphany received the Holy Communion in the Cathedral Church of Cashel.

The *Church Quarterly Review*, for January, says, The future ecclesiastical historian of our age will be compelled to place on record two facts of very different character. Against the acceptance of the Roman claims during the period 1845—1889 he will notify the secession from Vaticanism of an eminent Canonist like Schulte against the genius of Newman. He will place that of Ignatius von Dollinger as that of a recalcitrant from the latest usurpations of the Roman see; a man fully Newman's equal in all purely intellectual gifts, his superior in judicial clearance of outlook, and perhaps more than his superior in all the learning concerned with the history and claims of the Church of Rome. Nor is this all. He will remember how of three brilliant converts to Rome of an earlier date—Chillingworth, Boyle, Gibbon—one returned to the Anglican Church, while the other two became hopeless sceptics. He will ask himself whether this phenomenon has not been repeated in the nineteenth century. And even apart from the revival of the Jansenist Church in Holland, and the Alt-Katholik movement in Germany, he will find that in England it is impossible to specify any body of men of which so large a percentage has resiled. . . . The names of Foulkes, Jephson, Hemans, Case, Renouf, Hutton, are instances in point.

THE CHURCH PRECEDED THE BIBLE.—The *Church Times* very justly says, To make the Bible a teacher apart from the Church is to use it for other ends than God intended; and too many people are apt to forget, or perhaps have never been taught, that the Church was before the Bible, and that to the Church, and not to the Bible, was given the commission to teach, and the promise of the Holy Spirit's guidance.