

y 80, 1889.

AND
RIES.

urtains.

The Carpet
Previous
will offer a
patterns, at

s, Mattings,

ONS,

Life

S.

CDONALD,
g Director.



NG ST. E.
NTO

FR. I offer
arly Marble-
Longfellow
like, Marble-
aren bush,
Beans; All-
Drumhead,
ummoth and
Marblehead
ces; Phin-
wn's Dwarf
atoes; Hub-
shes. For a
of vegetable
ent FREE to
over of my
ad, Mass.

00

order to induce
is of new cus-
vegetable Seeds,
the Improved
tuce (the best in
rn); Olive Gem
wer, Cucumber,
x Beans, and a
rden variety in
00.
ative Catalogue,
Canada, is now

, ONT.

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.

June 2nd.—SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.
Morning.—Deut. 30, John 13, 21.
Evening.—Deut. 32; or Jos. 1. Heb. 9.

THURSDAY, MAY 30, 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 WORD TO ARCHDEACON FARRAR.—Archdeacon Farrar has undertaken the task of suppressing all ritual observances. He has an article in the *Christian World* in which he says: "In the New Testament, at any rate, and all that is externally precious of the Old, the elements of ritual are all but non-existent, and the sphere of opinion is reduced to the minimum. What is religion? what is its essence and aim? The answer of all Scripture may be summed up in one word: Righteousness." What does the Archdeacon make of the fact that our Saviour and the Apostles regularly attended services wherein could be seen ritual in a high stage of elaboration? What, too, of the fact that some of the most impressive and beautiful passages in the New Testament derive all their interest and cogency from ritual observances? No ritual in the New Testament indeed! What about the Epistle to the Hebrews? What about the worship in heaven revealed in the Book of Revelations? What about the Gentile converts being held bound to the ritual of the Law? Dr. Farrar goes on to sneer at all ritual forms by giving us a picture of Louis XV., one of the vilest of kings, who got out of his carriage to adore the Host. Suppose we turn on

Dr. Farrar and give him a picture of Robespierre, Camille Desmoulins and the rest of that crew of demons, who were anti-ritualists indeed. By Dr. Farrar's logic the crimes of those monsters arose from their their non-observance of ritual! Look, too, at Cromwell, another anti-ritualist, what of his blood guiltiness? Did Cromwell slaughter the Irish wholesale as a result of his anti-ritual notions? In our youth, a Quaker, one Tawell, committed murder, was that a natural outcome of his anti-ritual convictions? There is just as much reason to charge upon their anti-ritual notions the crimes of Robespierre, Cromwell and Tawell as to charge the vices of Louis XV. upon his ritual superstitions. Dr. Farrar declares that one word, "Righteousness" sums up the whole of religion. He omits worship entirely, an omission which brings him into direct conflict with the Divine teaching conveyed by the fact of the mosaic ritual having been revealed by the Divine object of worship and the source of all righteousness. Dr. Farrar spoils all his arguments against excessive ritual and against reliance upon ritual, by going so far in denouncing all forms of ritual as needless. If he were taken at his word what would become of those divine services he is paid to perform? A priest of the Church holding Quaker and Plymouth Brethren notions about ritual shows that these notions may be held along with a low sense of honour, that is, without "righteousness," so as regards religion the poor ritualist is in no worse a position than Archdeacon Farrar!

CLEVERLY UTILIZED.—The *Church Review* has been urging the adoption of "Extreme Unction." Recently Canon Wilberforce, of Temperance fame, has become a convert to the faith healing craze, he has publicly declared that while preparing for a surgical operation to be performed upon him he was anointed and the internal ailment passed away! The *Church Review* cleverly uses this as the basis of an appeal to the clergy to establish the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, or the anointing with oil for recovery from sickness, as there is no warrant for keeping this rite only for the dying. The situation is somewhat humorous to find one of Canon Wilberforce's school giving such an argument to those who are longing to bring back an usage now so thoroughly Romanist as Extreme Unction.

WHAT IS SACERDOTALISM?—After all, asks the *Church Times*, what is Sacerdotalism, but the principle of mediation exercised in the Church by a properly appointed ministry, and through divinely appointed means? It belongs to the whole body of the Church, but for the purposes of order is exercised by a few set apart by due ordination. This is the priesthood which Christ has conferred upon His Church, and the spread of Catholic teaching is gradually destroying the fatal tendency of Protestantism, which in practice at least regarded the clergy as a caste distinct from the laity, and never insisted upon the priesthood of the laity at all. Sacerdotalism, therefore, notwithstanding the odium which ignorance attaches to the phrase, asserts the privileges of the laity as belonging to a "kingdom of priests," as no other theory of the ministry does, and is as agreeable to the Divine working in the natural sphere, as it is to the appointment of Christ in His Church, in both of which the principle of mediation, or of working through agents and means, is clearly laid down.

THE ACCESSORIES OF WORSHIP.—In all the accessories of worship it is clear that the best of everything must be employed. If it is for the Lord's service, whatever we have, the best must be set apart for him. I can therefore thoroughly sympathise with those whose aim it is to consecrate the most beautiful to His service; and who can fail to appreciate the solemnising beauty of many of the noble buildings consecrated to the worship of God? But while we speak of the best we must be sure

that we understand what is best in God's sight. The most costly is not always the best—the two turtle-doves or the unleavened cake of the poor offerer under the Levitical law was quite as much the best as the more costly offerings of the rich. Nor do we mean by "best" that which is best as a work of art, for though it may be one of the best works of the best of artists, it by no means follows that it is best in the service of God; the best is that which is best adapted to fulfil the purpose for which it is employed, and a work of art that attracts attention to itself may be the worst instead of the best in fixing all attention upon Him whom we serve in our worship. This applies to all decoration and also to music. No one that studies human nature can doubt for one moment the marvellous power of music over the human mind, but it by no means follows that the elaborate compositions of our best masters are the best for congregational worship. And there may be heavenly melodies altogether inferior in their authorship and composition which, notwithstanding, are far superior in their power of humbling and uplifting the soul in its devout approach to the God whom we serve. We have, therefore, to consider not what is best according to the world's estimate, but what is really best for the service of Him who has honoured us with the sacred privilege of being His servants.

ARE ALL PROTESTANTS DAMNED?—Bishop Coxe has been publishing a refutation of statements made in a work by Father Muller—*Familiar Explanations of Christian Doctrine*—in which he asserts that "Protestants have never had any faith in Christ, and have therefore no claim for salvation," with other kindred misrepresentations. In contradiction to Father Muller, two other Catholic priests—Father Elliot and a Paulist, Father Young—assert through the press that Father Muller is wrong in saying that "there is positively no salvation outside the (Roman Catholic) Church." They believe that "divine faith being necessary to salvation, some Protestants having divine faith, they therefore have title to salvation." They thus publicly support Bishop Coxe in the controversy and oppose a priest of their own faith, for which they have been publicly accused of heresy by Father Muller. It is very good of these Fathers no doubt, but their opinion is not worth a row of pins, it is a matter of absolute indifference what they or the Pope himself thinks about non-romanists. It is not well to discuss opinions that are worthless.

CHURCH GOING.—Nothing but sickness or unavoidable detention keeps the business man away from the store. The customary habits of the house-keeper are attended to both as a matter of inclination and necessity. The young people pursue their study and amusements both as a matter of duty and pleasure. But, we ask again, how about the matter of church going? Strange that while business must be attended to in all kinds of weather, and as long as one is able to sit up, that while the temporal affairs of the household must be strictly looked after as long as one is able to keep about, and while school and places of pleasure must be constantly attended despite cold, rain, or a little headache, yet when Sunday comes, almost anything a little uncomfortable will be readily accepted as sufficient excuse for remaining away from the house of God. The excuses for absenting ourselves from the public means of grace are usually found to be trivial. When this is the case the loss to ourselves is irreparable. Providential circumstances, such as personal illness or waiting upon the sick, may be a reasonable justification for our absence. When we suffer ourselves to become so occupied with earthly interests as to forget his (God's) house, we can look for nothing less than spiritual leanness to come into our souls.

RELIGION is in a measure the living out the truth there is in us.