

14, 1887.]

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 is made, and then collect the whole amount, whether the paper is 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 Wootten, Proprietor, & Publisher,
Address: P. O. Box 2640.
Office, No. 11 Imperial Buildings, 30 Adelaide St. E.
West of Post Office, Toronto.

FRANKLIN B. BILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS for SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

July 17th.—SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY
Morning.—2 Samuel i.; Acts xx. to 17.
Evening.—2 Samuel xii. to 24; or xviii. Matt. viii. 18.

THURSDAY, JULY 14, 1887.

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

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

A CHURCH RETROSPECT.—The London *Guardian* says: "The comparison of the year 1887 is, to say the least, quite as interesting in Church matters as it is in the secular affairs of the nation."

There are, of course, many great improvements that have taken place in our branch of the Church since the accession of her Majesty. In 1887 the great Oxford movement was in its youth. It had not yet run into the dangerous course which led to the loss of the greatest English Churchman of the century; but, on the other hand, its influence was still narrow, and, to a great extent, unobserved. It had not made itself felt on the great mass of conventional, unawakened Churchmen, who were still content to go on as their fathers had gone on before them. One of the commonplaces of ecclesiastical history is the description of the dead state of the Church of England in the early years of this century. When the Queen ascended the throne this deadness was, indeed, passing away, and it was, perhaps, an external rather than internal deadness. But, in externals, the change is difficult to conceive and impossible to exaggerate. We now hear the leading speakers at Evangelical meetings congratulating their brethren on the revival in "Church order" as well as in "earnest religion," and yet it is difficult to know what can be meant by "Church order" but those improvements in ritual and ceremonial decency, and in the observance of the directions of the Church, which the predecessors of these speakers did their utmost to stifle and destroy. Beyond the limits of the Church this external change has spread to the Nonconformist bodies, and even to the rigid Presbyterianism of Scotland. There is beauty where there was ugliness; life where there was dead in-

activity; variety where there was dull monotony. And this great reform, which has been mainly the work of one section of the Church, has been accompanied by another even more important change, which we are glad to be able to ascribe to all parties alike. Though devoted pastoral work was far from uncommon in 1837, no one will deny that it is indefinitely more common, more thorough, more sound in 1887. The great towns have been divided up into parishes of comparatively manageable size; and though the increase of the population still defies our efforts to overtake it, a visible impression has yet been made on vast human hives like Leeds, and even on the most densely crowded and impoverished quarters of London. The standard of clerical activity has been greatly raised, and the sense of pastoral duty immensely quickened. All parties, as we have said, share in this advance, and it is needless to enquire whether it is due most to the influence of the Oxford movement, or to the earlier Evangelical revival. Along with these two changes has gone a clear development, almost a resuscitation, of doctrinal teaching in the Church. Not only, or even chiefly, the Sacraments, but the great fundamental and distinctive doctrines of Christianity are now preached and taught in place of colourless morality, or the vague Methodism which went by the name of the "Gospel."

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE SHIELD.—These three distinct changes are improvements so great and so important that it may seem ungrateful to turn to the other side of the shield, or to depreciate their value. But we cannot help noticing that the prospect is not so favorable as it was some few years ago. In two different directions there seems to us to be cause for alarm. Indications are not wanting that what are commonly called Church principles are either very loosely held, or are held in combination with opinions and principles that are really inconsistent with them. Is there not a danger of estimating a man's Church principles by the frequency of his services, or the flowers in his church? Yet in some cases these things are to be seen along with practices directly opposed to Church order, and with doctrines which might be taken from the Salvation Army. In other words, much of the so-called Churchmanship of the day is superficial and unsound, and will compare very ill, we will not say with the severe Tractarianism of the last generation, but with the simple loyalty to the Church which marked such families as the Kebles and the Hooks in still earlier days. This unsoundness may be traced in the recent growth of a tendency to ignore the vital differences which separate the Church from the Dissenting bodies. Men who would be injured if the name of High Churchmen were denied to them seem to be misled by an *ignis fatuus* which deludes them into the belief that the cause of Christian unity can be advanced by ignoring the divinely constituted limits of the Church. Such High Churchmanship as this is dearly purchased by surplice choirs and improved music. It implies a great deterioration in the whole conception of Church order and discipline, and displays a disregard of the fundamental principle of Episcopacy which was unknown among the originators of the High Church movement.

THE LESSON OF THE ABOVE RETROSPECTS.—In another direction also we seem to trace a change for the worse in the last few years. No one who remembers the strength and virulence of polemical Protestantism so late as thirty years ago, will think very seriously of the present manifestations of the same spirit, but the danger lies, not in its existing strength, but in its revival and growth. Some years ago this violent Protestantism seemed to be dying out. Evangelicalism was, and indeed still is, approximating to High Church principles, and the former contentions, it was believed, were not likely to be repeated. We cannot say that this

happy prospect still continues. The revival of ritual prosecutions has coincided with a certain return of the un-episcopal tone which used to mark Evangelical utterances. What has then become of the "Church order" of which we hear so much? The Church has not yet succeeded in securing the acknowledgment of her distinctive form of government from a large section of her members. We do not say that in this there has been a retrogression since 1837, but there has not been the advance that might have been hoped for. We have still to learn the rudiments of the doctrine of Church authority and Church discipline. The bigotry and violence of ultra-Protestantism we can perhaps afford to overlook; the recrudescence of these unpleasant manifestations of late is perhaps only temporary, and is certainly confined to a few; though we cannot disregard the signs that we are approaching another period of strife and prosecutions. Attack provokes defence, and open hostility has always stirred up the Church to proclaim her principles and to enforce her laws; our present danger lies in the obliteration of principles and the general disregard of the Church's laws. In both directions we see a tendency which is contrary to the great movement which was still young in 1837, and which if followed out will lead as surely to disaster as that did to growth and reform.

We do not wish to lay too much stress on what may be only a passing phase, and we have forgotten neither the great advances which we began by recounting nor the innumerable lesser benefits which the Church has gained during the present reign. The Church of England is a greater power in the world in 1887 than she was in 1837; she is greater because her clergy are more devoted, her laity more enlightened, her whole organization better adapted to the vast work she has got to do. All this we most thankfully recognise, and we shall not be thought ungrateful or timorous if we add to this acknowledgment of our gains the warning that the task that lies immediately before us is that of defending and strengthening our present possessions, as well as of pushing forward to make up what is still lacking to us. Church principles have further conquests to make; but they have also jealously to guard what they have won during the past fifty years.

A LADY ON COERCION.—The judgment of a highly educated lady on such a question as coercion is valuable, because her natural sympathies would be against harshness and injustice in legislation. The widow of Professor Fawcett is probably as well informed and as intellectual as those who in Canada object to unusual steps being taken to put down the reign of crime and terrorism. In reply to an invitation to a meeting of working women at Hackney, Mrs. Fawcett wrote:—"I am one of those who think that those who kill or shoot their neighbours, maim cattle, cut off the hair of girls and pour tar over their heads, ought to be punished whether they live in Ireland or in England. When punishment does not follow crime, even on clear proof of guilt, then it appears to me that the criminal law needs alteration. I have endeavoured to understand the provisions of the Bill now before the House of Commons, and without presuming to form a judgment on all of them, the most important appear to be those which have long formed part of the ordinary criminal law of Scotland and have worked well there. In particular, the power to examine witnesses on oath, before any person is definitely charged with a crime, appears to me very valuable. Without this power, which formed part of Mr. Gladstone's Coercion Act of 1882 the murderers of Lord F. Cavendish and Mr. Burke would never have been discovered. I am informed that a corresponding power forms part of the Scotch criminal law; and the present condition of Ireland points unmistakably to its necessity there."