

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 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 B. HILL, Advertising Manager.

LESSONS FOR SUNDAYS and HOLY-DAYS.

July 10th.—FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY
Morning.—1 Samuel xv. 20 to 24; Acts xv. 30 to xvi. 16.
Evening.—1 Samuel xvi; or xvii; Matt. iv. 23 to v. 13.

THURSDAY, JULY 7, 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.

THE RETORT COURTEOUS.—The *Christian Guardian* says that the clergy and laity in Toronto synod are all snobs, because in their allusions to the sectarian societies they were not called "churches." We have been under the impression that "snobbery" consists in offensively pretending to distinctions which are not based on recognized and legalized honors. Dr. Dewart has turned this upside down. We are not snobs because we wear a title that has been the honor of the Church of England for fifteen or sixteen centuries. We do not, however, call our neighbor by this vulgar word because he demands from us that we recognize his society as entitled to the honor and rank which in our case simply express an historical fact, the fact of our being the Apostolic and Catholic Church of England. We cannot call a society a "church" which was originated within the church only a few years ago, for we hold it God's truth that no man, no body of men, can organize a new church of Christ, and a "church" which is not Christ's church is an impossible thing. In our early days the Wesleyan's called their organization, "The society of people called Methodists," which was an honorable and a truthful title. Who changed the society into a "church" is unknown. It came about by the members being prosperous in worldly circumstances which made them anxious to rank socially with the adherents of the old church. That desire was and yet is the sole and only ground for a title which has no other basis whatever. We must ask our friend to keep his temper over this. Our name is a sacred heritage, we believe it to express a divine truth, we cannot confer it on nor share it with any man made society, for it is a holy trust. We "believe in our Catholic and Apostolic Church," how then can we help in creating

"churches" established by the whim of men? As a matter of fact every Wesleyan is, with us, also a member of this one church, why then should they desire to be members of another church? Surely it should satisfy Dr. Dewart to be a member of the church of Christ without being also a member of the so-called church of John Wesley? There is an old saying about the serving of two masters worth his quiet reflections when thinking this over. Dr. Dewart ranks, we find, as a Doctor of Divinity, does he give that distinction to every one of his ministerial brethren? We see by his paper that he does no such thing, but are we justified in calling it "snobbery" on his part to withhold this honor from those whom he knows never to have received it from authority? If a few men met and agreed to style each other doctor of divinity, would Dr. Dewart recognize their claim? No! he would consider it a deed of snobbery to assume this title without due warrant. Let him apply this to the matter of church titles, and he will see that withholding the name "church" from human societies we are acting from principle, and are not guilty of the "snobbery" charged against us. If Wesleyans would quietly ask themselves into what church they were baptized, they would realize the extraordinary incongruity of claiming to be members of the one church which is the Body of Christ, and at the same time members of another church which represents only a rent, a wound, in that Body which ere long will be closed up and healed and forgotten.

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—The attempt to create a rupture in the Church Missionary Society over the appointment of Archdeacon Blyth as Anglican Bishop for Jerusalem has, it is satisfactory to state, ended without producing the anticipated schism; and on Monday, after considerable discussion, the Members of the General Committee, who had been brought up from all parts of the country, separated in the most amicable fashion after declaring—that no reasonable person ever doubted—their adherence to the original principles on which the Society was established. The dispute has arisen entirely from Bishop Blyth's supposed sympathy with the Ritual uses of the Church at Bedford Park, Cheswick, in which he worshipped, and his occasional ministrations therein have been manufactured by narrow-minded partisans into a direct approval of what is commonly termed Ritualism, with all its accessories. Leaving out of the question the wisdom or unwisdom of the revival of the Bishopric, the controversy has raged entirely round the simple point of the Bishop's views and practice, and it may be well, therefore, to remark that his Lordship only assisted in the services at the churches nearest to his place of residence, and by so doing earned for himself all this objugation. On the principle that 'All's well that ends well,' we may hope that we have now heard the last of the matter.

THE REVOLT OF NONCONFORMISTS FROM POLITICAL MINISTERS.—The other day Lord Salisbury, in addressing a Primrose League meeting, pressed the importance of unionist organization, because, though we could not use the church or schools, the chapels were too often free for the political meetings of the Gladstonians. Lord Salisbury made a noble exception on behalf of the Wesleyans.

To my surprise, in the *Times* of May 27th, I found a letter from a lay member of the congregational body, asservating the truth of Lord Salisbury's statement, and pointing out strongly the objection to the political action of their ministers, and threatening in no vague terms the certain secession in consequence of many lay members of their congregation to the Church.

As regards the Baptists, I know a place where the too decided political action of the minister has already occasioned secessions from that Communion, and it is well for Nonconformist ministers to take warning betimes. It is tempting, if from any cause the numbers in Nonconformist chapels

seem to be falling off, for the ministers to become political, and I have heard threats even on the part of Wesleyan ministers of the possibility of their being driven to take such a course. But the real reason and justification of Dissent is that it is essentially religious. If there is neglect on the part of the clergyman to visit his people, and to witness earnestly for Christ, there is some justification for others entering in. If the clergyman of the parish is essentially worldly, or a too energetic politician, there is a reason to protest against the enervating influences of a State establishment, but you cannot denounce political or State connection and be yourselves political; it is an unreality your people will not understand. Thus writes Lord Nelson in *Church Bells*. We shall have a break soon among certain Nonconformist bodies in Canada, whose ministers have betrayed their Protestantism in zeal for political allies.

THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS UNITY.—In a valuable article published in the *Evangelist* upon "Christian Union," the Rev. Dr. Schaff says, alluding to the action of the House of Bishops:—

"What shall be done with this proposition? To ignore it would be discourteous; to repel it would be unchristian. The only proper course is to notice it in the same spirit of kindness and desire for union and harmony in which it was offered."

There is a growing under-current towards the reunion of Christendom passing through the churches in Europe and America. The Evangelical Alliance founded in 1846 in London, and the General Conferences of Evangelical Christians from all denominations and countries convened by it from time to time, have done much to manifest and strengthen this desire. The Pan-Anglican Council, the Presbyterian Alliance, the Pan-Methodist Conference, have given it a more ecclesiastical and semi-official character. This tendency cannot be repressed; it will gradually pervade the churches and become a powerful factor in history. Christians are getting tired of division and distraction. The world stumbles at the multiplication and unholy rivalry of sects, and loses confidence in the church as a house divided against itself.

After discussing the various methods that have been proposed, Dr. Schaff goes on to say:—

"True union can only be built on the historic basis of mutual recognition of the peculiar gifts of God which he has bestowed upon the various branches of His church, and the work which they have done and are still doing in the world."

"The denominations must lay down their exclusiveness, their vanity, and pride. They must cease to imagine and to boast that they have the monopoly of truth, that they alone have the scriptural creed or form of government or mode of worship. Romanists must learn to recognize genuine Christian life and power outside of the Papacy. Episcopalians must acknowledge the validity of non-episcopal orders. Lutherans must concede to the reformed that they have the real sacrament, though they cannot accept the notion of a corporeal presence or oral manducation; Calvinists must not so hold divine sovereignty as to deny human responsibility; and Arminians must not teach human freedom to the exclusion of the all-controlling purpose of the Almighty. Baptists must allow other modes of baptism than by immersion."

"We need a pentecostal effusion of the holy spirit of love to Christ and to all His followers, which will destroy envy, jealousy, pride, and bitterness, and to make an end to the miserable, narrow, bigoted, exclusive sectarianism that has so long turned churches into hostile camps. Then, and not till then, will Christian union appear bright as the sun, lovely as the moon, and terrible as an army with banners; and then the world will know that the Father did send the Son to make peace between God and man, and between all who profess to love Him in sincerity and truth."